NPS ARCHIVE
1965
HARBAUGH, N.

Library
U. S. Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California

DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY
NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
MONTEREY CA 93943-5101

EVALUATION OF THE IMPACT OF AN EXECUTIVE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM ON UNITED STATES MILITARY PERSONNEL

by

NORMAN R. HARBAUGH

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Business Administration

Graduate School of Business Administration
George F. Baker Foundation
Harvard University

January 1965

NPS Archive
1965
Haribaugh, N.

DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY
NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
MONTEREY CA 93943-5101

ABSTRACT

EVALUATION OF THE IMPACT OF AN EXECUTIVE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM ON UNITED STATES MILITARY PERSONNEL

Norman R. Harbaugh

Graduate School of Business Administration
Harvard University

January 1965

The basic objective of this study was to analyze and evaluate factors which influence the impact experienced by military personnel attending the Harvard Advanced Management Program, under the sponsorship of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, in order to discover how military participation in this Program can be made more effective.

One of the two major sections of this thesis considers the training objectives of the training institution, the objectives of military sponsoring activities in sending military officers to school, and the personal objectives of military participants themselves as these objectives interrelate and as they influence the impact experienced from attendance at the Program. Data for this section were gathered by interview and by questionnaires sent to both military sponsoring activities and to military participants who had attended the 35th through 44th AMP Classes during the five year period from 1959 through 1963. Of particular significance was the conclusion drawn from these data that sponsoring activities might improve the impact received from participation in the Program by developing more specific and detailed formal objectives and by disseminating these objectives, together with other helpful information about the career implications of the Advanced Management Program, as guidelines for the formulation of mutually beneficial personal objectives by officers selected to attend the Program.

The other major section of the thesis deals with an analysis of how certain selected factors affected the impact received by military participants in the Program. Data for this section were taken from the questionnaire sent to participants. Comparisons were made between the responses of participants by Service affiliation (Army, Navy, and Air Force) and a composite military position was established. Wherever practicable, this military position was compared with that of non-military participants who had previously attended the Harvard Advanced Management Program. The data on non-military participants were made available by Professor Kenneth R. Andrews, of the Harvard Business School, from a study he had made of 39 resident, university-sponsored, executive development programs which included the Harvard Program. Conclusions drawn from the data on military participants may be of interest and be helpful to both the training institution and the military sponsoring activities.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was made possible because of the interest, cooperation, and support of representatives of the United States Army, Navy, and Air Force at all levels within these organizations. The receptiveness of Service Headquarters in Washington toward such a study provided encouragement to the author that a useful purpose for analysis of military participation in the Harvard Advanced Management Program was officially recognized and reassured military subordinates that their participation in this study was in the best interest of the military service.

The truly remarkable response, both in quantity and in quality, from sponsoring activities and from individual participants of all three Services testified to their enthusiasm and desire to help improve military participation in the Program. To these organizations and individuals, scattered throughout the world, goes a great deal of the credit for any validity of the results of this study.

I am grateful for the guidance and assistance received from my thesis committee consisting of Professor Lewis B. Ward, as chairman, together with Professors Alva F. Kindall and Robert W. Merry. Also of assistance were Professors Kenneth R. Andrews, John D. Glover, and Renato Tagiuri who gave generously of their time and related research data and Miss Patricia Glavin who helped assemble some of the data concerning non-military participants in the Harvard Advanced Management Program.

While the assistance, support, and cooperation of all of these people made this study possible, the design, conduct, and conclusions of this research are solely my responsibility.

Boston, Massachusetts
January 1965

Norman R. Harbaugh

- TABLE OF CONTENTS -

Chapter		Page
	Acknowledgements	i.
1.	INTRODUCTION	1.
2.	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	17.
3.	ANALYSIS OF OBJECTIVES	32.
	Training Institution	33.
	Sponsoring Activities	37.
	Army	39.
	Navy	44.
	Air Force	52.
	Participants	60.
	Army	63.
	Navy	72.
	Air Force	81.
	Recapitulation	92.
	Summary	105.
4.	ANALYSIS OF FACTORS INFLUENCING IMPACT	108.
	Optimum Length of Program	108.
	Army	109.
	Navy	110.
	Air Force	111.
	Composite	112.
	Preferred Course Content	115.
	Army	117.
	Navy	120.
	Air Force	122.
	Composite	125.
	Quality of Instruction	132.
	Army	133.
	Navy	136.
	Air Force	138.
	Composite	141.
	Optimum Class Composition	145.

TABLE OF CONTENTS continued

Chapter		Page
	Personal Interest in Selection	150.
	Army	153.
	Navy	156.
	Air Force	158.
	Composite	161.
	Optimum Age and Rank	167.
	Army	170.
	Navy	171.
	Air Force	172.
	Composite	173.
	Formal Education	176.
	Personal Effort	182.
	Army	183.
	Navy	185.
	Air Force	186.
	Composite	188.
	Climate Upon Return	192.
	Army	195.
	Navy	197.
	Air Force	199.
	Composite	202.
5.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	209.
	APPENDIX	
	A	230.
	B	231.
	C	239.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background

Since the Second World War there has been tremendous growth and interest in the field of management development. This is true not only in the business world and government, but within educational institutions as well. In fact, one of the most significant developments in business education during this period has been the initiation and expansion of university-sponsored executive development programs designed for practicing executives. Although such programs experienced exceptionally rapid growth during the early 1950's, the enthusiasm expressed for them appears to have been more than a temporary phenomenon. Most of these management development programs, having survived the 1958 recession, now seem to have stabilized in growth. Even today, however, tremendous amounts of money are still being spent on university-sponsored management development programs. Characteristically, the cost of these programs has been borne by business organizations, governments, or other sponsoring activities who send practicing executives to attend courses at no expense to the individual participant.

Despite the rapid growth and popularity of executive development programs over the past two decades, only within the last twelve years has there been much thought given to

the evaluation of the effectiveness of these programs. Up until the mid-1950s many companies were willing to settle either for no evaluation at all or for generalizations drawn from attitude surveys. Since the reactions of participants were overwhelmingly favorable, and considering the existence of generally affluent economic conditions, most companies accepted the reasoning that the nebulous nature of such development programs made any type of objective measurement extremely difficult. People who had participated tended to endorse their experiences as helpful and rewarding. Although there was no tangible proof immediately available to indicate what, if anything, was really gained by participation in a management development program, there certainly did not appear to be any harm involved and matters of expediency favored continued use of these programs. Consequently, costs incurred for executive development were generally exempted from the scrutiny and reviews, such as return on investment, to which other major expenditures were subjected.

More recently, however, company officials have become more skeptical of the value of executive development programs, especially of university-sponsored programs. There are feelings within some companies that executives learn by doing more than by studying in an academic atmosphere and that on-the-job training is therefore preferable to formal training organized according to "scientific principles." Some charges have been made to the effect that

universities lack effectiveness in their executive development programs because they offer programs broad enough to accommodate the needs of participants of a wide range of ages, experiences, and education and who come from a wide variety of companies varying both in size and type of endeavor - in short, they attempt to be all things to all people. Although these latter charges appear to have some validity, it is only reasonable to expect that companies exercise care and judgement in selecting those institutions of learning which offer the objectives being sought by the companies seeking their services and the participants whom they sponsor. Nevertheless, this hard look at executive development programs by business has caused universities to critically review their programs and to make those adjustments necessary to satisfy business' new outlook on executive development.

Focusing on the Problem

Perhaps the greatest factor underlying the basic skepticism of university-sponsored executive development programs is the inability to determine, specifically, the benefits derived from such programs. Unlike the training of lathe operators, welders, or typists, the results of management training defy quantification. Apparently businessmen, however, in return for the loss of an executive's services for what might be considered a prolonged period of time, together with the attendent costs involved, are

beginning to look for something more specific than an assurance that the experience was "broadening."

Professor Kenneth R. Andrews of the Harvard Business School conducted a study of thirty-nine resident executive development programs sponsored by universities throughout the United States and Canada in order to determine the impact of these programs as expressed by over 6,000 of the more than 10,000 participants of the programs over a five year period of time. These programs ranged from two to thirteen weeks in length. Although about one-sixth of the respondents reported that they were "broadened" by their experience, some more specific results were obtained which may prove helpful both to businessmen and universities in improving their respective participation in such executive development programs.

There has been no indication to the writer of any skepticism, paralleling that of businessmen, by the military services with regard to their participation in university-sponsored executive development programs. The Services have, however, been actively participating in such programs for many years by sponsoring both civilians and military officers as students. For instance, the Army, Navy, and Air Force have sponsored a total of 157 senior military officers at the Harvard Advanced Management Program alone during the six year period from 1958 through 1963 (Army 55; Navy 49; and Air Force 53). Yet no evidence exists of any attempt

to evaluate the impact of executive development training on participants or to determine what, if any, benefits accrue to the sponsoring Services.

The purpose of this study is to determine, for military participants of the Harvard Advanced Management Program specifically, the impact experienced from their attendance at the Program and to compare the experiences of military versus non-military personnel who have attended the Harvard Program. By design, many aspects of the present study parallel that of Professor Andrews in order to facilitate the comparison of his data on non-military participants with the data gathered through this study on military participants. Furthermore, material developed from this military study will be examined in light of other recent studies in the field of management development in order to analyze the type and nature of similarities and differences as they affect program impact.

From analysis of the data generated by this study, I intend to report on the general effectiveness of advanced management training to military officers and point out variations in experiences as expressed by personnel from each of the three Services. Perhaps the very initiation of a study purported to evaluate the impact of a training program, together with the questions raised in the process of gathering data for such a study, will stimulate a critical review and self appraisal of the objectives and practices currently

used within each Service organization which participates in the Advanced Management Program. In addition, the observations and recommendations resulting from this study should be more explicitly helpful in devising ways for improving the effectiveness of each Service's participation in the Program.

Evolution of the Study

The problem of defining a study project with a scope narrow enough to be viable yet with sufficient material to offer potential significance was of no small concern. A basic desire and moral compulsion existed to select a topic associated with the Navy and preferably one which would serve to benefit the Navy in some useful manner. The framework of interest was established within the field of executive development and tempered by a long standing influence and association with educational endeavor. A review of the literature concerning university-sponsored executive development programs disclosed only about six extensive studies, the most comprehensive of which was that of Andrews. Professor Andrews very graciously consented to a detailed examination of the data compiled from his study and to the use of such data in any further contemplated studies.

Since the Navy has participated in the Harvard Advanced Management Program since 1946 without any apparent

review or evaluation of the benefits derived from this participation, and considering the very interesting data already compiled on non-military participants of this Program (the largest of those studied by Professor Andrews), an opportune situation appeared evident whereby a feasible study of benefit to the Navy could be made of the impact of the Advanced Management Program at Harvard on Navy participants. In view of the fact that naval officers had to hold the rank of at least Captain to be eligible for Navy sponsorship for attendance at the Advanced Management Program, it was not reasonable to expect early participants in the Program to still be on active duty, or perhaps even alive, some fifteen to eighteen years later. Certainly the anticipated response to questionnaires would be quite low. On the other hand, selection of a five year period of time, similar to that used by Andrews, did not provide a large enough population (approximately forty Navy participants) to assure valid conclusions. The time period for an effective study on military participants in the Advanced Management Program had to be selected in consideration of the availability of a population currently in a position where it might reasonably be expected that its members could utilize their Program experiences. One of the problems encountered in this respect, which is peculiar to a military population, is the provisions for early retirement. Military officers may retire, at the convenience of the

Government, any time after completing twenty years of military service. Practically all of the Navy officers eligible to attend the Program have completed at least twenty years service and have the prerogative, therefore, of submitting their requests for retirement shortly after completing the Program.

In consideration of the foregoing problems, an alternative approach was selected - that of increasing the population to include both Army and Air Force military participants in addition to the Navy. This increased the scope of the study slightly by providing for comparisons of inter-Service differences and similarities. The potential usefulness was enhanced,however, by extending the analysis of Program impact to the other two major Services which sponsor military participants in the Program. This approach increased the population over the five year time span to 129. The five year period, starting with the thirty-fifth AMP class in February 1959 through the forty-fourth AMP class of September 1963, was selected for study in order to reduce the probability of retirements and deaths. In addition, since Professor Andrews' study terminated with the AMP classes in 1958, my questionnaires were expected to be more favorably accepted by a group that had not previously answered a quite similar line of questions. Actually, the validity of this reasoning was indicated by the fact that only a sixty-two per cent return was realized

on the field test questionnaire sent to the two Advanced Management classes of 1958 (previously solicited by Andrews), whereas an eighty-one per cent return was received from the 1959 through 1963 group of participants who had not been solicited by Andrews.

Limitations of the Study

The very process of narrowing the scope of this study has, of necessity, introduced some obvious limitations. Despite the availability of data which can conveniently be used for valid comparison of military and non-military personnel reactions to management training at one of the largest and most prominent training programs, one must bear in mind that the results of this study portray only a minority group (military) at one of many training institutions. Even more subtle are some unique characteristics of military practice and custom which may exert strong influences on the degree and nature of impact experienced from participation in management training programs but which may not be apparent to the reader. For example, it is generally well known that military officers are rotated between duty stations quite frequently and thus change jobs more often than their civilian counterparts. On the other hand, it is generally less well known that military officers usually attend several schools, most of which are at the post-graduate level, during their service careers in contrast to

their civilian counterparts who are less oriented in formal schooling subsequent to completion of their basic education. These so-called unique characteristics will be noted, where detectable or known, throughout the study, in explanation of differing influences on program impact when comparing non-military with military participants.

Another limiting factor which must be recognized is that this study consists predominatly of an attitude survey and, although the questionnaires have been designed to both limit and detect bias and inconsistency, a certain amount of bias is bound to exist. Instances where this is suspected or obvious will be noted throughout the report on this study. The "halo effect," however, sometimes associated with the replies participants feel are "appropriate" in order to preserve their image and prestige for having attended the Program should theoretically be somewhat less prevelant with military than with non-military participants because of the more recent formal training experiences of the military which should provide the basis for a more critical analysis of relative worth of each training program. There are no known methods by which an experimental, quantitative, or more exacting measurement technique can be used to evaluate the impact of management development programs, such as the Harvard Advanced Management Program, on individual participants. The heterogenous and generalized

objectives of all concerned, when coupled with the fact that, by virtue of experience and training, each participant enters the program at widely varying levels of accomplishment, render any valid quantification of results either extremely dubious or virtually impossible.

Keeping in mind both those limitations ascribed and alluded to, the reader may more intelligently follow the descriptions and analysis of data, together with the conclusions drawn from such data, throughout this thesis.

Organization and Presentation

Chapter Two describes in detail the research methodology employed in this study and provides an insight into why certain techniques for data gathering were selected, how these techniques were developed, how data and conclusions drawn from such accumulated data were verified, and how these data were used in contributing to the fulfillment of the ultimate objective of this study.

Chapter Three is devoted to a discussion on objectives. Of a necessity, any meaningful treatment of this issue must include the objectives of participants, the Service activities which sponsor the participants, and the training institution itself since it is the interrelationship of these various objectives which most likely would influence the impact a participant receives from attending

the Program. Even though objectives from all three sources in this study were rather vague and general, several interesting conclusions have been drawn from the relationships of these objectives and their effect on the impact experienced by individual participants. It was quite obvious to the writer that some of the sponsoring activities did not possess a formal listing of objectives for participation in the Advanced Management Program although a list of objectives was provided by many of these activities in response to a questionnaire asking for such information (see Appendix A). Perhaps whatever thought and reflection required of the representatives of these sponsoring activities, in order for them to answer the questions posed regarding objectives, may have been helpful to them in formalizing heretofor informal or undocumented objectives, or at least in stimulating some concern along this line.

Chapter Four consists of a detailed analysis of how nine selected factors influence and contribute to the impact experienced by military participants in the Harvard Advanced Management Program. The rationale behind the selection of these specific factors is discussed in Chapter Two. The type and degree of influence exercised by each of these factors is examined with respect to how it affects military as compared with non-military participants. In addition, an analysis is made of consistency between the

Service groups - Army, Navy, and Air Force - and explanations regarding dissimilarities are advanced and discussed. Several hypotheses were developed on the basis of findings from previous studies on university-sponsored executive development programs and these hypotheses are tested by the data gathered in this study.

In both Chapters Three and Four a uniform pattern is used for the organization, analysis, and discussion of data. After presenting the material by individual Service groups (Army, Navy, and Air Force), a military composite is developed to summarize the military position and compare it, wherever practical, with non-military data. While this system of presentation involves considerable redundancy, it is considered justified because of the nature of interest in the subject. Representatives of each of the Services should be able to review, rather independently, that area of this study which is of special interest to them without having to refer back for orientation to sections of the presentation in which they have little or no interest.

Finally, Chapter Five presents a summary analysis of the data discussed in detail in Chapters Three and Four. From this analysis, certain conclusions are reached which form the basis for suggestions on how the Advanced Management Program at Harvard can be more effectively utilized by the Military Services.

Definition of Terms

The definitions attached to certain terms which might have specialized meanings and therefore might be ambiguous as used in this study are provided for clarification of content.

Career Pattern refers to the sequence of positions held by an individual officer, together with the optimum future sequence of duty assignments, which would be most advantageous in preparing him for advancement and positions of increased responsibility.

Climate is the perception an individual has of his total work environment, including personnel, organization, policies, procedures, and operations.

Duty Assignment refers to the job or position held by a military officer.

Executive Development and Management Development are used interchangeably throughout this study.

Impact is the value or useful effect derived from participation in a university-sponsored executive development program.

Need refers to a requirement or personal deficiency, as perceived by an individual, for which some satisfaction is desired.

Population is the total number of military personnel of the Army, Navy, and Air Force who attended the Harvard Advanced Management Program during the period 1959 through

1963 (AMP Classes 35 through 44 inclusively).

Program and Course are used synonomously in referring to the Advanced Management Program at Harvard.

Service refers to any one or all of the three major armed forces (Army, Navy, or Air Force) considered in this study.

Sponsoring Activity refers to the bureau, office, or command within the Army, Navy, or Air Force establishment which nominates a military participant for the Advanced Management Program and finances the costs involved.

Response to Questionnaires

Most of the data for this study were gathered through the use of two questionnaires - a short one, consisting of three questions, to sponsors of military participants in the Advanced Management Program (see Appendix A), and a much more comprehensive one sent to individual participants in the Program (see Appendix B). The response to both questionnaires was exceptionally good, amounting to eighty-six per cent return and an eighty-one per cent return respectively. Furthermore, the quality of response was remarkably good and consistent between the three Services. Enthusiasm on the part of participants was evidenced not only by their quick and strong response but by such overt acts as the addition of personal notes, elaboration of strong

feelings, and the occasional placement of additional postage on the return envelope in order to send it back via air mail rather than by regular mail as provided on the prestamped envelope.

Because of the design of the study, which concentrated on the most recent five year time period, the number of participants who had retired from active duty was minimal. Although the degree of response was somewhat higher from retired participants (88%) as compared with participants still on active duty (81%), this is not too significant in view of the small number of retired personnel in the population (eight). The distribution of retired personnel between the three Services was rather marked, however, with the Air force leading in the number of retired participants (six), followed by the Navy (two), and the Army (none). The significance of this disparity is discussed in Chapter Three in connection with objectives.

CHAPTER 2

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The following detailed description of the research methodology used in compiling the data for this study should help the reader to gain a perspective on the nature of the undertaking and an appreciation for the problems and limitations involved. Basic to a study on evaluation of training effectiveness is the matter of objectives and selection of meaningful criteria for use in evaluation. The methods for treating these two important issues will be explained in detail, followed by a description of the development and use of the questionnaires sent to military participants and their sponsors and an explanation of the method used in verification of the results of this study.

Objectives

An effective evaluation of the impact of the Advanced Management Program on military personnel must take into consideration the objectives for such a program. Objectives, however, may vary as between participants, military agencies sponsoring the individual participants, and the training institution itself. Therefore, all three sources of objectives must be considered and reconciled to the extent possible in evaluating impact of training. Data on objectives, as formulated by all these sources, were gathered through the use of both questionnaires and interviews.

Two separate questionnaires were utilized - one to the sponsoring agency and the other to former participants in the Program.

Questionnaires to Sponsoring Agencies

The questionnaire distributed to sponsoring agencies appears as Appendix A to this thesis. It was short and simple, designed to ascertain what, if any, objectives actually existed for sending senior officers to a university-sponsored management school. Of the three questions contained in the one-page questionnaire, question one was straightforward in asking for the sponsoring activity's stated objectives and for what changes, if any, had been made in these objectives within the past five years. Question three, which inquired about the changes expected in the participant being sponsored, was intended to further develop and to help validate question one by drawing a relationship between the answers to two differently worded questions pointed toward the same issue. The second question on this questionnaire was essentially the same as question six on the questionnaire for the participants of the Program. The purpose for this cross referencing on what the participant was told prior to attendance at the Program was twofold. First was the attempt to ascertain any relationship between the specificity of sponsors' objectives and the extent to

which objectives were communicated to participants. In addition, there was the desire to determine the effectiveness of communications between the sponsor and his participant - did the participant receive the message the sponsor thought he conveyed?

As expected, the objectives were very general and rather vague. Personal interviews with responsible representatives of several of the sponsoring agencies established the fact that formal written objectives did not exist at the time the questionnaires were distributed. The writer suspects (as a result of sampling interviews and the wording of returned questionnaires) that this was true of most of the sponsors.

One of the problems incurred with soliciting information from the Services was that of directing questionnaires to the proper administrative organization within each Service and to the proper level within each organization. In order to insure correct placement of questionnaires and to contact responsible individuals at the appropriate level, the writer delivered most of these questionnaires personally to appropriate individuals who acknowledged responsibility for determining objectives and explained to them the purpose of the study. This personal contact also provided helpful information concerning the differences between the three Services in administering graduate training for military officers. Especially pertinent was the

differences in the methods for selecting candidates for the Advanced Management Program at Harvard. The Army, for example, made all selections at Headquarters in Washington without advice or recommendations from its field activities. The Air Force asked each of its major field commands to nominate not more than two officers for each Advanced Management Program class but final selection, to fill the Air Force's quota of candidates, was made at Headquarters in Washington. The Navy, by contrast, practiced decentralized selection whereby each technical bureau or office made its own choice of candidates within prescribed numerical quotas but without centralized review. It should be obvious, therefore, that requests for data on objectives of sponsoring agencies would be directed to different levels in each Service organizational structure. Whereas one copy of the questionnaire would suffice for the Army, multiple copies of the questionnaire would be necessary for the other two Services. Although final selection of candidates from the Air Force was made at Headquarters, objectives should exist at those field commands which recommended their officers for the Program. Therefore, in addition to Air Force Headquarters, seven of the major Air Force field commands which most actively participated in nomination of officers for management training were solicited by questionnaire as to their objectives in sending officers to the Advanced Management Program. Finally, questionnaires were

delivered to six Navy bureaus and offices which have sponsored participants in the Program during the past six years.

Eighty-six per cent of the questionnaires to sponsors were completed and returned. This response was encouraging, especially in view of the suspicion that objectives had to be formalized, perhaps for the first time, by sponsoring activities or that an admission was necessary to the effect that no specific objectives existed.

Questionnaires to Participants

Information regarding the personal objectives of participants was obtained by answers to questions seven, nine, and fifteen in the questionnaire distributed to all military participants in the Program (see Appendix B). Question seven consisted of two parts. The first part, focusing on that period of time immediately preceding attendance, inquired into what the individual hoped to get out of the Program. The second part of the question asked whether or not the individual's earlier objectives had changed during the period of the Course and, if so, in what respect. The purpose of this question was threefold - to determine to what extent the participant had considered his personal objectives prior to attendance at the Program; why, and to what extent, his objectives may have changed during the Course; and what effect, if any, the communication of his sponsor's objectives may have had on his personal objectives.

Question nine asked to what extent the participant's objectives were influenced by any intentions of applying benefits derived from the Program to civilian pursuits. This question could relate very closely to personal objectives and, if answered honestly, might shed some light on the effect of obligated service agreements required by each of the Services and upon the question of optimum age and rank for sending military officers to the Advanced Management Program. This entire issue can also be related to the number of retired officers within each branch of the Service at the time of the survey as a possible, even though crude, indication of validity.

Question fifteen, placed apart from the other questions relating to objectives in order to avoid suggested or conscious consistency, was designed to give further insight into the participant's objectives by inquiring into his basic motivation for attending the Program. The response to this forced-choice question was then related to the open-ended question (question seven) on personal objectives as a check on consistency.

Training Institution

The objectives of the Harvard Business School were determined by interview of faculty members and a review of literature on the Advanced Management Program. Both sources of information helped not only to establish current objectives

but to relate a trend in the changes of objectives over the past several years, together with reasons for such changes.

Evaluation of Objectives

The consideration of objectives established by all three parties (sponsors, participants, and the school) is essential to this study in that these objectives should be evaluated for consistency to determine how either this consistency, or lack thereof, affects the impact realized by participants from attendance at the Program. Furthermore, the response to question eight, an open-ended question asking what the participant gained from his experience, was classified according to the same standards used in evaluating question seven on objectives, so that an evaluation of results versus expectations would be facilitated. Data generated by research in this area of objectives will be related to findings by other students in the field, and to hypotheses developed from a study of the literature, in Chapter Three of this thesis.

Criteria For Use In Evaluation

Factors Affecting Program Impact

After a rather comprehensive review of the fairly voluminous literature pertaining to evaluation of management training, only a half dozen extensive studies were discovered which pertained specifically to university-type executive

development programs.[1] A more detailed analysis of these studies disclosed a great deal of uniformity of results together with certain common factors which influenced the impact of each training program. Certain of these factors were selected for study and analysis in connection with this project because of their treatment in Professor Andrews' study and because of their significance to military participants attending a civilian university-sponsored training program. By extracting from Professor Andrews' study of 39 university-sponsored executive development programs that data pertaining only to participants of the Harvard Advanced Management Program, and by using many of the identical factors found by Andrews to influence program impact, the writer attempted to make a valid comparison between the impact experienced by military personnel, as determined from the data collected in this study, with that experienced by non-military personnel as reported by Professor Andrews. Several additional factors of influence on impact (e.g., Optimum Age and Rank, and Personal Involvement in Selection) were also selected because of their peculiarity to the military situation. The factors selected were as follows:

---

[1] Bakke (1959); McKay (1960); Andrews (1961); Powell (1962); Gormbley (1963); and McCarthy (1963).

Optimum Length of Program

Preferred Course Content

Quality of Instruction

Optimum Class Composition

Personal Involvement in Selection

Optimum Age and Rank

Formal Education

Personal Effort

Climate Upon Return From Program

The questionnaire sent to military participants of the Advanced Management Program was designed to solicit data which could be used in analyzing the effect of each of the above listed factors on impact experienced from attendance at the Program. The data collected from the response to these questionnaires, in addition to being compared with the results of Andrews' study, was used to test certain hypotheses developed from a survey of the literature on evaluation of management training. The detailed results of this analysis are contained in Chapter Four of this thesis.

Development and Use of the Questionnaire Sent To Military Participants

The population for this study consisted of all the military personnel of the Army, Navy, and Air Force who attended the Harvard Advanced Management Program during the period 1959 through 1963. As would be expected, this

population (129 total participants) was dispersed throughout the world. Obviously, the use of personal interviews to collect data was impractical. The immediate task, then, was to design and test a preliminary questionnaire which would generate the data necessary for evaluation of the impact military personnel experienced from the Program and to do so in such a manner that would permit a valid comparison of such data with the results of Professor Andrews' study of non-military personnel.

Many of the questions on the preliminary questionnaire for military participants in the Advanced Management Program were taken from Professor Andrews' questionnaire with his permission. Certain of these questions were modified slightly to adapt them more appropriately to military custom and usage. The meaning and intent of the questions, however, were carefully preserved in order to insure the possibility of validity in comparison of responses.

As a result of numerous interviews with Army, Navy, and Air Force officers attending the Harvard Advanced Management Program, the writer gained some insight into additional sources of influence for determining impact of the Program. From this information, questions were designed to further solicit data which would be helpful in better understanding the military participant's evaluation of his

Program experiences. For example, question seventeen on the final questionnaire (see Appendix B) asks whether or not the participant thinks he would have benefited more from a military-sponsored course in executive development attended exclusively by military personnel. The answer to this question, when compared with the response to question sixteen, concerning reaction to composition of the student body, helps identify the system of values developed by military participants.

In order to determine whether the questions being asked were clear to those who would be called upon to answer them, the preliminary questionnaire was field tested by sending it to Army, Navy, and Air Force officers who attended the two Advanced Management Program sessions held in 1958 (AMP 33 and AMP 34). From the twenty-seven officers who attended these sessions, a sixty-two per cent response was received which was adequate to point up the two or three areas where minor modifications to questions were desirable in order to reduce the possibility of misinterpretation. The final questionnaire appears as Appendix B.

Since the population consisted of senior officers of all the Services (Colonels through Major Generals in the Army and Air Force and Captains and Rear Admirals in the Navy), and since these officers were all considerably senior to the writer, precautions were taken to avoid offending any of the participants through the use of inappropriate questions.

The questionnaire was cleared with Rear Admiral D. G, Irvine, Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel, prior to distribution.

Inasmuch as honest answers to some of the questions might embarrass certain individuals in the eyes of others and because of any possible reluctance on the part of some respondents to criticize either their Service or the School, the questionnaire was returned anonymously to encourage maximum candor. The letter of transmittal (see Appendix C) which accompanied the questionnaire assured each participant that replies would not be used in any manner which could identify any individual. Respondents were asked not to indicate their name or to sign their returned questionnaire. Further assurance was given that returned questionnaires would not be made available to Armed Services representatives or to Harvard University but would be destroyed upon completion of this research project. No attempt was made to number questionnaires or to code them in any way which would identify an individual respondent. A color code was used, however, to identify the Service affiliation of each respondent since comparisons between the three Services was an integral part of the research design. All questionnaires sent to Army participants were printed on green paper, those to Navy participants on white paper, and those to Air Force participants on pink paper. This permitted quick and easy identification

for manual collation in the process of evaluation of data.

In addition to the appeal from a military student to former military students in behalf of a cause purported to improve military utilization of the Advanced Management Program, cooperation was sought through an attractively assembled questionnaire and by providing first-class two-way postage with self-addressed return envelopes for convenient response. Although the individual effectiveness of these various appeals cannot readily be determined, the combination proved exceptionally effective. Within a half a week after mailing, a seventeen per cent return was received. In fact, the response was so strong that even an initial follow-up was unnecessary. Eighty-one per cent of the population eventually responded with a fairly even distribution between the three Services (Army 85%; Navy 78%, and Air Force 79%). Such a high percentage of return appears even more noteworthy in consideration of the fact that these questionnaires were mailed during the middle of the summer (July 22, 1964) when the heaviest reassignment of military personnel traditionally occurs and when a large number of people usually take vacations. Furthermore, the quality of responses was consistent with the quantity. Not a single questionnaire had to be discarded due to unintelligibility, obvious unreliability, horseplay, or intentional maliciousness. On the contrary, most responses appeared to be carefully

considered and, in several instances, the respondents wrote personal notes to explain strong feelings where they felt the questions did not provide for adequate expression of such feelings.

By defining the population for this study as the entire group of military participants in the Advanced Management Program over a five year period of time, the statistical implications of sample size and the problems of sample selection were avoided. Responses from the relatively few officers who had retired from active military duty since completion of the Program were treated the same as responses from officers on active duty. An attempt was made, however, to discern any significant variations in response between these two groups and to explore the implications of such variations. In those instances where practices or conditions peculiar to the military appeared to influence or distort the comparison of military and non-military data, such phenomena were pointed out and reconciled.

Verification of Data and Analysis

The data received from respondents were manually tabulated for analysis. This was possible because of the small population involved. In order to verify the data received, however, and to verify the conclusions reached from analysis of the data, a random sample of twelve participants

of the Program was interviewed. The sample consisted of a representative number of participants from each of the three Services and was drawn both from those officers who had been solicited by questionnaires and from officers who had attended the Program subsequent to the last class included in this study (the forty-fourth AMP class which graduated in December 1963). During the course of the interviews the participants were questioned so as to determine their reactions to the answers tabulated from the returned questionnaires. In addition, they were informed of the conclusions drawn from these answers and their reactions to these conclusions were noted. These reactions are summarized in Chapter Five of this thesis.

CHAPTER 3

ANALYSIS OF OBJECTIVES

This chapter will deal with the respective objectives of the training institution, the sponsoring activities, and the military participants in the Harvard Advanced Management Program. After individually examining the type and nature of these objectives, relationships will be developed and conclusions will be drawn to show how these various objectives, and the relationships which exist between them, affect the impact experienced both by the participant and his sponsor through participation in the Program.

The importance of training objectives has been continuously emphasized in the extensive literature dealing with management development training programs. These objectives must be specific if they are to be meaningful, and an attempt should be made, to the maximum extent possible, to correlate the objectives of the training institution, the sponsoring activities, and the individual participants in order to achieve the best training results. Furthermore, without a set of well defined specific objectives, it is extremely difficult to evaluate effectively, even on a superficial basis, any training program. While reviewing the literature in the field of management training, a central theme emerged which was expressed most concisely by Bakke[1] and which, with

---

[1] Edward W. Bakke, A Norwegian Contribution to Management Development. (The Administrative Research Foundation, Norwegian School of Economics and Business Administration, Bergen, 1959), p. 145.

minor modifications, is expressed as a general hypothesis for this study on military subjects.

> The degree of benefit to both the Service and individual participant realized from university-sponsored executive development programs is closely related to the clarity and adequacy of the anticipation of expected value and to the sense of purpose in attending the program.

Results of the analysis of data on objectives in this study will be related to the above hypothesis in this chapter.

Objectives of the Training Institution

It is not surprising that, in view of the rather recent inception, rapid growth, enthusiastic reception, and wide coverage of subject matter characterizing most university-sponsored executive development training programs, the objectives of these programs tend to be rather general and vague. In fact, one of the major criticisms of universities which conduct executive development programs is that they attempt to accommodate too wide a spectrum of needs by catering to a clientele of such diversified ages, backgrounds, company associations, organizational levels, and experiences that much of the training is misdirected and therefore rendered ineffective. Under such circumstances, one might well expect stated objectives to be all inclusive,

general, and vague. Those universities which do have more specific objectives, however, find it necessary to continually review and revise those objectives to meet the needs of businessmen engaged in a rapidly advancing technology. The frequency and nature of revisions in objectives may, in fact, be an indication of the sensitivity of a training institution to the adequate fulfillment of its mission.

A War Production Training Course of fifteen weeks duration was initiated at the Harvard Business School during the Second World War at the request of the United States Government. The training objectives at that time were to provide highly specialized training of a vocational nature in certain critical skills in the field of industrial management. Of a necessity, the course was production-oriented and designed to meet the needs of middle management or even lower-middle management personnel. After the War, Harvard was asked by representatives of some of the companies which participated in the war-time training course to continue a training program designed to prepare men for greater executive responsibility. In response, Harvard initiated the Advanced Management Program of thirteen weeks duration in 1945.

By 1948, however, there had been a substantial shift away from the production-oriented approach as the objectives of the Program changed from a concentration on vocational specialties in industrial management to an emphasis on general management training. There was, nevertheless, considerable

functional content in several of the courses which were offered. During the ten year period from 1948 to 1958 there was a gradual movement toward more generality in the objectives of the Program and, as a consequence, in the course content. This resulted in objectives so general and vague that they became almost meaningless and the Program might well have been considered a cure-all for whatever ailed the participant. Students ranged from lower management through top management levels. This trend, rather characteristic of executive development programs at that time, was undoubtedly responsible for the criticism previously mentioned regarding the attempt of universities to cover too wide a spectrum of individual needs.

Since 1958, the Harvard Advanced Management Program has been shifting its emphasis toward accommodating top management personnel. In focusing the Program on the top management level, steps were taken to reduce the functional orientation of courses and to shape those courses into a general management context aimed specifically at mature men who either occupied top management positions or who showed promise of growing into such positions in the near future. New courses and new concepts were added to the curriculum to keep pace with the advancing technology in business management. These new additions were directed toward the needs of top management executives and included such features as mathematical techniques used in making decisions under

conditions of uncertainty and the use and relationships of various disciplines in the field of social science, especially such disciplines as Psychology and Anthropology.

Although the objectives reflecting the latest trends in the Advanced Management Program have become somewhat more specific now that the Program has been more acutely focused on a particular segment of the executive field, the stated objectives for the 1963-64 Program still were rather general. The announced general purpose of the Program at that time was as follows:

> "The Advanced Management Program is designed for mature men of notable promise and growing capacity for the burdens of the topmost level of management; it is designed for people who, in the course of something like twenty years or more of practical activity, in jobs of progressively greater scope, complexity, and responsibility, have developed and shown unusual talents for management. The purpose of the Advanced Management Program is to provide such men, after they have reached or closely approached the general policy-making management level of their organizations, with an opportunity to enhance their qualifications for top-level positions by means of an educational experience aimed specifically at meeting needs of modern top management."

The general nature of even the more specific objectives characteristic of universities which sponsor executive development programs, however, may be inherent in the program itself since it is this same lack of specificity which complicates the attempt to quantify and evaluate the effectiveness of executive development training.

Objectives of Sponsoring Activities

Although the general and vague training objectives of universities sponsoring executive development programs may be rather disconcerting, there is even more cause for concern, in this respect, with regard to the objectives of those agencies which sponsor participants in such programs. There is reason to believe that many sponsoring agencies actually do not have any formal objectives and that those which do profess to have objectives usually can cite only superficial generalities which provide little or no help in defining concrete purposes for participating in a management training program. Perhaps this condition developed and was perpetuated by the enthusiastic reaction to the initiation and growth of university-sponsored executive development programs. The shortage of executives in an expanding economy following the Second World War encouraged businesses to patronize educational institutions which had established executive development training programs as a means for

developing and improving executive talent. Continued business expansion, together with a generally affluent economy, promoted complacency on the part of sponsoring agencies to the point that valid or specific training objectives and careful evaluation of benefits from these executive development programs was seldom seriously considered. Even after some companies began to question the value of university-sponsored executive development programs, there is little indication of any attempts on the part of sponsors to establish or revise specific objectives for their participation in such programs.

The Armed Forces were quick to take advantage of university-sponsored development programs and have participated consistently in several such programs by sponsoring both military officers and civilian employees. There is every indication, however, that the Services have followed the pattern of business sponsors in failing to establish meaningful, specific objectives to clearly define the exact purpose of their participation in these training programs.

More specifically, during this study an attempt was made to determine what objectives existed within the Services which sponsor military officers attending the Harvard Advanced Management Program. This attempt consisted of a combination of personal interviews and questionnaires directed to those sponsoring activities within the Army,

Navy, and Air Force which nominate military personnel for attendance at the Advanced Management Program. On the basis of several interviews with representatives of sponsoring agencies, and the generalized statements advanced in response to the questionnaire's inquiry as to the stated objectives for participation in the Program, there was serious doubt, in many instances, as to the existence of formal or stated objectives at the time of inquiry. In view of this observation, an eighty-six per cent return of the questionnaire appears to be exceptionally good. The questionnaire sent to sponsors appears as Appendix A. The responses to this questionnaire from sponsoring activities within the three Services are reported and evaluated below. Certain relationships between the objectives of sponsors and their effect on participants are noted and discussed.

Army Response

Due to the centralized selection procedure practiced by the Army in choosing its participants for the Advanced Management Program, the only response solicited by questionnaire was that of Army Headquarters in Washington, D.C.

Sponsor's Objectives: In reply to the question regarding stated objectives for participation in the Program, the Army merely referred to that section in Army Regulations which had to do with Education and Training. The latest edition of that Regulation (July 10, 1956), pertaining

specifically to Advanced Management Training for Officers, covered two advanced management programs utilized by the Army - the Harvard Advanced Management Program and the Management Problems for Executives course offered by the University of Pittsburgh. It was interesting to note that, although there were some significant differences between these two programs, the Army's objectives for participation were identical for both programs. The thirteen week course at Harvard was available only to officers of the rank of Colonel or above whereas the much shorter eight week course at Pittsburgh was available to Lieutenant Colonels and Colonels. The Army's common objective for both courses was stated in Army Regulation 350-210 as follows:

> "The objective is to assist students in developing their understanding of fundamental factors rather than to provide direct answers to specific questions. The majority of the students are mature, experienced executives from business and industry selected for this instruction by top management because of their greater potential with the organization. It is evident that this training, and the association with civilian executives, is most valuable in preparing and equipping Army officers to assume responsible positions within the Army Establishment."

This objective might well have been a paraphrasing of a school catalogue which described the course objectives. It is broad and general enough to cover a wide range of training endeavors but offers very little guidance to participants sponsored by the Army and gives little indication of any serious thought in trying to establish specific and concrete objectives for program participation.

Under the circumstances, it is not surprising that there has been no change in objectives within the past five years. In fact, it is noted, from the date of the latest Army Regulation covering this issue, that these objectives have not changed in over eight years. This, perhaps, helps to explain the Army's response to the second question on the questionnaire regarding communication of the sponsors' objectives to the participants prior to their attendance at the Program.

The relationships between the stated objectives of the Harvard Business School for its Advanced Management Program and those of the Army are similar in that both are general in nature and broad in concept. The Army's objectives, however, are much more abstract and, although they could be considered applicable to both the earlier and most recent objectives of the Advanced Management Program, gradual revisions in Harvard's objectives reflect a concentration on training for top-level management which is not specified

in the Army objectives. It is obvious from the Army's practice of sponsoring only very senior officers in the Program, however, that they consider this Course to be oriented toward top level management needs.

Communication with Participants: In response to the question inquiring into what the participants were told after their selection had been announced but prior to their attendance at the Program, the sponsor stated that the newly designated participants were furnished a copy of the referenced Army Regulation together with the descriptive literature provided by the university conducting the program to be attended. They were also provided with the names of previous Army participants in their respective programs. In essence, the Army offered practically no guidance and imparted no information with respect to why participants were selected to attend a program, what was expected of them both while attending the program and upon completion of the course, how this might affect their military career, etc. Each participant was free to consult officers who had previously attended the program for which he had been selected and to draw his own conclusions with regard to any questions he had concerning attendance at that program.

The lack of specific objectives on the part of the sponsor may account for the meager information communicated to the participant. Although many participants acknowledged

receipt of the material which the sponsor said was provided, forty-seven per cent of the respondents, by their negative response, indicated that either they did not receive the material or that such material was not considered substantial enough to warrant an affirmative reply to the question, "What, if anything, were you told by your sponsoring activity upon selection but prior to attendance at the program?" In fact, one Army officer reported that, at the time of his selection, he was not sure what he hoped to get out of the Program because he did not know much about the Program.

Expected Changes in Participants: Finally, in answer to the inquiry of what changes were expected in officers who participated in the Advanced Management Program, the Army stated that no changes were expected. Perhaps the question was misinterpreted, for it is not reasonable to assume that participants are unaffected by attendance at the Program or that the sponsor intends nothing to have happened as a result of the experience. Otherwise there is little justification for the expense of time and money in participation. The Army's concern for what its participants receive from the Program is evidenced by the comprehensive reports and evaluations received from those participants upon completion of their course. A personal review of one of those evaluation reports disclosed many interesting comments and observations which could have proved helpful to future participants if the information had been disseminated.

Navy Response

The highly decentralized selection system practiced by the Navy, whereby each technical bureau or office nominated and sponsored its own military officers for attendance at the Harvard Advanced Management Program, required solicitation of information from six different activities. All of the six activities returned the questionnaire. The majority of respondents appeared to have seriously considered the questions and carefully formulated their answers.

Sponsors' Objectives: The response to question one, inquiring about the stated objectives of sponsoring activities patronizing the Advanced Management Program, was quite uniform. Despite the disparity of functional interests represented within the various sponsoring activities (staff corps officers, unrestricted line officers (including aviators), and engineering duty officers) there existed a remarkable uniformity in the stated objectives of each sponsor. Most frequently mentioned were those objectives concerning development of a more comprehensive understanding of the problems and principles of business management from the top level management point of view and the opportunity to broaden and supplement Armed Service experience and training through the acquisition of a better perspective in the relationship of business and government.

The majority of stated objectives were of a professional nature characterized by such statements as:

> "Development of broader understanding and skill in business practices leading to the general improvement of business management in the Navy."
>
> "Development of a broad perspective in understanding and dealing with Navy business problems."
>
> "To improve Bureau management."
>
> "...opportunity to gain an overview of business management, its problems, and approaches to solutions."

The second most common classification of objectives listed by Navy sponsors was of a general nature. Representative stated objectives in this category were:

> "To offer officers of outstanding record and potential an opportunity to better fit themselves for more responsible positions in the naval service."
>
> "Develop better naval officers, more effective executives, and more useful citizens."

The only other classification of objectives offered by Navy sponsors was in the personal category and had to do primarily with the creation of a favorable image of the Navy and of naval officers by affording the opportunity for

participants to communicate the Navy's position on many controversial issues of modern business practices and by demonstrating the general competence of individual participants.

There was one admission by a sponsoring activity that formal objectives had never been established, but a general purpose was stated in vague terms. As a result of several interviews with representatives of sponsoring activities, and judging from many of the responses, there was reasonable doubt as to the prior existence of formally established objectives within most of those activities which participated in the Program. The obvious thought and consideration which characterized most of the responses may have been helpful to the individual sponsors in stimulating a review and reflection on their purposes for participating and on the benefits derived from such participation in the Program.

Navy sponsoring activities were almost unanimous in replying that their stated objectives had not changed during the past five years. If it is actually true that these objectives existed as early as 1959, Navy sponsors anticipated, or perhaps even led, the Harvard Business School's gradual shaping of the Advanced Management Program objectives toward accommodation of top-level management needs. The compatibility of objectives between the training institution and the Navy sponsoring activities, even though rather general in nature, is remarkable. The Navy's consistent practice of sending only

very senior officers to the Program, however, indicates a conviction of the applicability of the course to top-level management even though some of the thinking behind the expression of objectives may have been influenced by relatively recent stated objectives of the Business School where the emphasis has been placed on top-level management development.

The one sponsoring activity which reported a change in objectives was late in returning its questionnaire. The delay was explained as partially due to a recent review of that activity's management programs and management training. This sponsor, like the others described, submitted a very general objective - "To develop in the officer an appreciation for and understanding of 'top-level management' and all it implies." With such a broad objective, frequent changes would not ordinarily be necessary or expected. The reported recent change, however, had to do with reducing the management level of training. More specifically, the change stated ". . . that management training would be better utilized by Commanders vice Captains. Consequently, a Commander is being sent in 1964 to the University of Pittsburgh's Management Program for Executives in lieu of a Captain to Harvard's Advanced Management Program." While the Advanced Management Program is now designed for high-middle and top management personnel, the Management Program for Executives at Pittsburgh is designed for relatively low-middle management personnel.

The various aspects of age and rank of participants in relation to the management level of training is discussed in Chapter Four of this study.

Communication With Participants: Practically all of the Navy sponsoring activities reported that they briefed their prospective participants prior to their attendance at the Program. This briefing generally consisted of information about the basis and reasons for selection of candidates, the over-all plan of the Course, the make-up of the student body, and the sponsor's objectives for sending participants to the Program. Selectees were advised to apply themselves diligently and to create, within their student body, a favorable impression of the Navy. Only one of the sponsors indicated that it was not really necessary to tell its prospective participants anything about the Program over and above the information contained in the literature already provided them by the training institution. This sponsor stated that the officers who were selected for participation were already aware of the objectives of the Program and were eager to accept the challenges, opportunities, and responsibilities which went with attending the Course. By way of contrast, however, another sponsoring activity stated that it followed the practice of discussing the Program with prospective participants prior to nominating them for attendance. At that time, the sponsor's objectives were outlined and the prospective participant was informed of what was expected of him during his attendance at the Program.

In addition to the information which sponsors said they communicated to their participants, the Navy Department conducted a three day briefing for all naval officers preparing to attend the Advanced Management Program. The purpose of this briefing was to acquaint these officers with the Department of Defense and Navy Department problems and policies with regard to the world situation in order that participants at the Program would be better informed about current events and the position of the Military in those events.

Despite the positive statements of sponsoring activities concerning the briefing of their participants prior to attending the Program, over two-thirds of the Navy participants who responded to their questionnaires stated that they were told nothing, or practically nothing, by their sponsor. This discrepancy was not the result of any time interval, since negative responses ranged from AMP classes in 1959 through the latest class in 1963. Several participants remarked that although they were told nothing specifically, it was well known that selection for attendance at the Program was a recognition of superior performance and an indication of promotion potential. Those respondents who did acknowledge the receipt of information about the Program from their sponsoring activities described the content and extent of this information quite differently. While some reported

the receipt of specific and detailed information such as why they were selected, what their sponsor's objectives were in sending officers to the Program, what would be expected of them while attending the Program, what they might expect upon completion of the Program, how attendance at the Program might affect their career pattern, etc., others cited the receipt of only very general and superficial information such as a general description of the Course, the purpose of attendance and its benefit to the Navy, or that attendance at the Program was most helpful for promotion.

The anonymity with which this study was designed in order to encourage maximum candor made it impractical to identify and associate individual respondents with their sponsoring activities in order to more positively identify the source of discrepancy. The preponderance of discrepant responses between sponsoring activities and participants, however, is indicative of more than a casual misunderstanding. Apparently participants were not benefiting from pre-attendance briefings to the extent assumed or expected by their sponsoring activities, or perhaps there was a breakdown in communications between those individuals in a position to establish policy and answer questionnaires for the sponsor and those individuals who were responsible for briefing participants prior to their attendance at the Advanced Management Program.

Expected Changes in Participants: The changes which Navy sponsoring activities expected in their respective participants, as a result of attendance at the Advanced Management Program, were primarily of a professional nature which was consistent with the sponsor's stated objectives. Characteristic of this type of expected change were qualities expressed by such statements as:

> "An increased ability to handle diverse and complex situations."
>
> "Better understanding of business and industrial problems as related to the Armed Forces."
>
> "More mature judgement in the execution of future duties."

The only indication of expected changes other than professional was one reference to a hope that participants would develop "a broader outlook," which would be classified as change of a general nature, and one reference to an expectation of "increased confidence," which would be classified as change of a personal nature.

In contrast to the uniformity of answers on the type of changes expected of participants in the Program was the wide spectrum of answers in response to the question of how soon these various changes were expected to materialize. Some sponsors expected immediate results, some felt that

change would be gradual, and still others said they expected some immediate results but thought that certain expected changes would have to develop continually with practice. Considering the types of changes enumerated by the sponsoring activities, perhaps the latter approach represents the most realistic expectation. For instance, immediate changes seemed to be indicated in general outlook, exposure to new ideas, broader understanding, greater tolerance, etc., whereas the development of more mature judgement, greater skills and ability, etc., emerge gradually as the result of continued practice and growth. The validity of this interpretation is strengthened by the fact that there has been no indication of dissatisfaction on the part of sponsoring activities due to the failure of participants to achieve the expectations of their sponsors.

Air Force Response

Of the seven major Air Force commands which predominatly nominated officers for selection to attend the Harvard Advanced Management Program, five returned the questionnaires which had been given to them. Two of the five sponsors appeared to have carefully considered the questions and formulated rather general, yet responsive, answers.

Sponsors' Objectives: Judging from the responses of sponsors, the Air Force has not developed specific objectives

for participating in the Advanced Management Program. The objective advanced, in answer to an inquiry about stated objectives, was that contained in an Air Force Memorandum distributed by Headquarters to prospective sponsoring agencies announcing the convening date for the next Advanced Management class, briefly describing the Course, and inviting nomination of qualified officers for selection at Headquarters. The objective stated in that memorandum really related to the purpose of the Program and read as follows:

> "This program is an intensive course of study concentrated within 13 weeks. It is designed to develop personnel for advancement to positions of wide responsibilities and to make each participant a more effective executive in any management position."

One respondent merely referenced this memorandum in answer to the question on sponsor's objectives, while another, adopting and quoting from the memorandum, stated the sponsor's objectives as, "To develop Colonels for advancement to positions of wider responsibilities and to make each participant a more effective executive in any management position." There were no attempts to elaborate further or to offer any more specific objectives.

The Air Force's stated objective certainly must be classified as general in nature but it is too broad and all encompassing to be of much guidance and assistance to Air

Force participants preparing to attend the Advanced Management Program. Since the objective is equally applicable to all levels of management, it is inconsistent with the Air Force practice of sending only very senior officers to the Program, which practice is clearly an indication of intent to utilize the Program for top-level management training. Furthermore, because of its extreme generality, the Air Force objective lacks the focus on top-level management development which characterizes the more recent objectives of the Harvard Advanced Management Program.

Under the circumstances, with a generalized objective which could be adopted for just about any management development program in which the Air Force chooses to participate, there is little need for periodic review and revision. Consequently, it was not surprising to find that there had been no significant changes to the Air Force's objective within the past five years.

Communication with Participants: Of the three Air Force sponsoring activities which responded to the question concerning what participants were told prior to their attendance at the Advanced Management Program, only one stated that its participants were told nothing. The reasoning behind this answer was explained by the statement that the officers nominated for the Program already knew why they were selected, what was expected of them, and how attendance at the Program

would affect their career. The implication was that selection for the Program was widely regarded as a mark of recognition and a highly coveted opportunity which would enhance an individual's service career. The other two respondents were quite uniform in their replies. Both sponsors reported that their prospective participants were briefed prior to attendance at the Program. They were assured that their selection was based on demonstrated ability and future potential, that it was a personal tribute to their outstanding performance of duty, and that the Air Force was demonstrating faith in their ability to continue moving up the ladder to the highest echelons of management. They were also advised of the responsibilities and obligations attendant to their participation in the Program. There was no mention of sponsor's objectives in the briefings by sponsoring activities, but this is understandable in view of the lack of specific objectives together with the limited or questionable value to participants of the stated general objective.

Considering the response described above, it was not surprising to find that sixty per cent of the Air Force respondents reported that they had been told nothing by their sponsoring activities prior to entering the Program. Those participants who did acknowledge receipt of information from their sponsors generally confirmed the statements of their sponsors as to the type of information disseminated.

Expected Changes in Participants: Only two of the Air Force sponsoring activities which responded to the questionnaire indicated that they expected changes in the officers they sponsored as a result of their attendance at the Advanced Management Program. These two respondents, however, were quite consistent in their answers to the question on what changes were expected in participants in the Program and how soon these changes were expected to materialize. Most of the anticipated changes were expressed in rather general terms characterized by such statements as:

> "Expect the officer to use this course as a base on which to expand his interest and study in the management area."
>
> "Expect the officer to return highly motivated in the field of management."
>
> "Expect the officer to acquire a broader perspective."

Expressed changes of this type might well be expected since they are consistent with the very general nature of the Air Force's stated objective. In addition to the professional overtones contained in some of these broadly stated expected changes, however, there were a few specific changes mentioned which were clearly professional, such as:

> "Expect the officer to obtain greater knowledge of industry and academic

approaches to better management. . .
as well as improve the management function which he now supervises."

Changes of a personal nature were also expected in individual participants, evidenced by such expressions as:

"Expect the program to help further the development of the individual."

Neither respondent expected immediate changes in the officers they sponsored. In answer to the question of how soon after completion of the course changes would be expected, one respondent stated that his organization "would expect to observe improvements in the individual and his management functions within three to six months after completing the school." Both sponsors, however, felt that change would be gradual rather than revolutionary and that attendance at the Program should have an influence on the participant during the rest of his service career.

Relationship Between Sponsors' Objectives and Selection of Participants

The extremely broad objectives stated by sponsoring activities within the three Services, especially within the Army and Air Force, afford practically no guidance in the matching of objectives to needs of prospective participants. The criteria for selection of officers to attend the Advanced Management Program, as stated by one sponsoring

activity of the Air Force, are as follows:

> "Officer must be serving in the grade of Colonel. Officer must have less than 21½ years Promotion List Service.
> Officer must have had extensive experience in management positions.
> Officer must be presently occupying a key management position.
> Officer's current performance must indicate that he has the potential for further growth and he will be assigned to even more important management positions in the future.
> Officer must be personally nominated at the Deputy Chief of Staff level.
> Officer must personally desire to pursue this course of study."

These criteria were rather typical of those which existed within other sponsoring activities. One additional, yet significant, prerequisite required of the Army was that each officer must agree to remain in the Service for at least four years following completion of the Program. Whereas the Air Force required thirty-nine weeks of obligated service, the Navy had no obligated service requirements whatsoever.

During the course of interviewing representatives of several sponsors and representatives of those organizational units which actually made the selection of participants, one

unwritten, but all important, prerequisite for selection was discovered - the officer must be in a position where he can be spared and made available by his superior for the thirteen weeks required for completion of the Course. This unwritten requirement sometimes conflicted with certain stated criteria. For instance, by virtue of the fact that an officer was in a key management position, his superior was many times reluctant to release him for a three month period of time.

Although one of the criterion for selection of participants, which was enumerated by the Air Force sponsor above (that pertaining to an officer's potential for further growth and advancement), closely relates to broad previously stated sponsors' objectives, most of the criteria specifically delineate conditions which must be met before an officer is qualified to attend the Advanced Management Program. Selection, by these standards, seems to be a mechanical process of matching personnel nominated for selection against a list of prerequisites. One or two participants mentioned the fact that their selection was timed to coincide with a new assignment in which it was expected they would benefit from attendance at the Program. Other than this, there was no indication of any effort on the part of sponsors to try to match individual needs to Program objectives. The noted generality of objectives, however, may be an extenuating circumstance in this respect since such broad objectives could conceivably

fit a wide spectrum of needs. It should be pointed out that there was no indication of any attempt to use the Advanced Management Program for any remedial purposes.

Objectives of Participants

Aside from the objectives of the training institution and the sponsoring activities, an attempt was made to determine the personal objectives of military participants in the Advanced Management Program prior to their attendance at the Program. This was done by a separate questionnaire to participants (Appendix B) through a question (Question 7) asking "What did you hope to get out of the program?" An open-ended question of this type was used in order to encourage maximum freedom of participants by permitting them to express, in their own words, what they hoped to gain from attending the Program. An attempt was made to examine the relationship between objectives of sponsors and those of their participants and to determine the influence of sponsoring activities on the formulation of the personal objectives of their participants.

Two additional questions were dispersed through the questionnaire to generate information which would supplement and perhaps validate data regarding personal objectives of participants. Of these two questions, the first (Question 9) inquired about the intent, on the part of each participant, of applying any benefits derived from the Program to civilian

pursuits, and the second (Question 15) was designed to help determine the underlying motives behind an individual's attendance at the Program. The answers to both of these forced-choice questions were related to the free-expression answers of question seven and interesting associations are described in this chapter. Furthermore, a relationship was drawn between what a participant hoped to get out of the Program (his objectives before attending) and what he actually did get out of it. Information regarding the latter was compiled through the use of question eight on the participants' questionnaire - "What do you think happened to you as a result of having attended the Advanced Management Program?" This question permitted the same freedom of choice and expression as question seven, on objectives, with which it was compared. Inherent with open-ended questions of this type, however, is the wide range of answers emerging from unprompted minds. It then becomes necessary to classify heterogeneous responses into logical categories by nature of their content. For purposes of uniformity and comparison of military data compiled in this project with data on non-military respondents covered by Professor Andrews in his study of participants in the Harvard Advanced Management Program, the same five categories of responses used by Andrews were adopted for use in this thesis and the same standards of classification were used in analyzing and grouping

responses to the two open-ended questions - on objectives (Question 7) and accomplishments (Question 8). These categories are listed and briefly defined as follows:

GENERAL refers to non-specific comments which have to do with broadening the thinking or point of view of participants. Examples include such statements as: "A general broadening of education," "Broadening mental horizons," and "Broadened outlook on matters other than technical."

PROFESSIONAL refers to those comments concerning the attainment of greater knowledge and competence in business management. Emphasis may be placed on a functional orientation or on functional relationships between business and the military establishment. Examples include such statements as: "Acquisition of management techniques for large organizations," "Improvement of ability to communicate," and "Obtain new management ideas."

ANALYTICAL refers to comments regarding improved problem-solving ability, greater objectivity, increased opportunity for further study, and more independence of thought. Examples include such statements as: "Gain an appreciation of how top management approaches and solves problems," and

"Improve decision-making ability."

ETHICAL refers to statements concerning spiritual growth and development, recognition of management's obligations to its employees and to society, and to modification of attitudes toward others. An example of such a statement is: "Better understanding of businessmen and their part in business and society."

PERSONAL refers to comments regarding development of greater self-confidence, self-respect, new friendships and associations, and the enhancement of the participant's well-being. Examples include such statements as: "Acquire friends in industry," "Improve promotion potential," and "Prove the capability of military personnel."

Army Participants

In response to the question, "What did you hope to get out of the program?" slightly over fifty per cent of the Army participants indicated that their objectives were of a professional nature. There seemed to be a compulsive feeling to gain a better understanding of management principles and techniques in an effort to increase the individual's capability for better and more enlightened management. Two other classifications of objectives, mentioned with about equal frequency and accounting for over forty per cent

of responses, were those in the personal category and those in the general category. Personal objectives were characterized primarily by statements of desire for association with top-level leaders in the business world, but several objectives referred to increased promotion potential and the preparation for retirement opportunities. General objectives were most frequently expressed through the use of that greatly overworked word, yet most accurate single word, for describing general objectives - "broadening." Although both ethical and analytical objectives were expressed, the frequency was such as to render these categories insignificant (four per cent and two per cent of responses respectively).

In practically every instance, there was no acknowledged change in the personal objectives of participants during the Course. There were two participants, however, who had no objectives prior to attending the Program, that indicated a change during their attendance. One such respondent said he did not know enough about the Program prior to attendance to be sure of any personal objectives aside from that of promotional potential associated with completion of the Program. He went on to say that during the Course his objective emerged as "a desire to improve my thought processes and broaden my education in a manner that bore no direct relationship to my military career." The other respondent stated that "prior to attending (the Program) I had only vague ideas as to what the Course was

about and had not seriously related it to my own career." He reported that during the Course his interest was aroused toward the objective of developing techniques for dealing with people more effectively. As might be expected, the sponsoring activities initiated the idea for both of these respondents to attend the Program but apparently failed to prepare them adequately for their new experience.

In an attempt to determine what, if any, influence the existence and communication of objectives by sponsoring activities had on the formulation of a participant's personal objectives, a question was asked of participants, "What, if anything, were you told by your sponsoring activity upon selection but prior to attendance at the program? (e.g., Were you told why you were selected, what your sponsor's objectives for training were, what was expected of you while in school, etc?)" Forty-seven per cent of the respondents reported that they were told nothing by their sponsors. Earlier in this chapter, however, under "Army Response," the reply of the Army sponsor to an almost identical question was disclosed. The sponsor stated that prospective participants were provided with a copy of the official regulations covering Education and Training and the names of former Army participants in the Program, together with the descriptive literature provided by the training institution. Perhaps the participants did not consider such information from the sponsor substantive enough to help them develop an adequate appreciation for the

Program or at least to satisfy the suggested purposes offered in the question by way of example. Furthermore, only thirty per cent of those respondents who indicated that they were told nothing reported that they would like to have been told why they were selected, what was expected of them, and where they might be utilized upon completion of the Course. Most of the others felt that they were sufficiently aware of why they were selected and of what attendance at the Program meant to their career potential that they did not need to be so informed by their sponsor.

The majority of those respondents who acknowledged receipt of information from their sponsor indicated they were told that their selection was an acknowledgement of outstanding performance and a prediction of great potential for advancement. Several participants reported receiving comprehensive briefings with more elaborate information about how they could benefit from the Program. Undoubtedly, such information was imparted at the local command level and varied within individual commands. Virtually all of those who reported that they received information from their sponsor were satisfied that nothing further was required or desired.

The extremely general objectives of the Army, together with the meager and general nature of communications between sponsor and participant, might lead one to conclude that any influence of the sponsor on participants would induce personal objectives of a general category. This, of

course, is at variance with the actual response of the participants. On second thought, however, there is a logical relationship between lack of direction on the part of the sponsor and the professing of professional objectives by participants. If a participant is given little or no guidance as to what is required of him as a result of attending the Advanced Management Program, it seems reasonable to expect that he might conclude that he was being sent to school to learn how to improve himself and would, therefore, predominatly direct his personal objectives toward the attainment of greater proficiency in management so that he could demonstrate and apply his experiences in this respect to his service assignments.

In order to gain further insight into participants' objectives, a forced-choice question (Question 15 in Appendix B) was asked to determine whether participants were primarily concerned with development of their reasoning and thought processes or with development of specific administrative skills. Slightly over eighty-one per cent of the Army respondents said they were primarily concerned with development of thought processes. This would perhaps appear inconsistent with the nature of objectives stated in response to question seven, where more than half of the participants indicated their selection of professional objectives and only about twenty per cent of the objectives were classified as general. As previously pointed out, however, most of the

professional objectives were expressed in very general terms, such as "Develop increased capability for management and increased understanding of management problems," and "Acquire a better understanding of management principles." Under the circumstances, it is quite conceivable that a participant could establish professional-type objectives, yet concern himself with the development of his reasoning ability and thought processes which he considered essential to acquiring increased proficiency in handling top-level management assignments. Furthermore, the majority of those respondents who indicated that their primary concern was the development of specific administrative skills were quite consistent in that their freely-expressed objectives were described in more specific terms and in more detail than those of many of their contemporaries. For example, stated objectives such as "Acquire techniques for managing large groups of people," "Acquire detailed knowledge in specific fields of business which could be applied to Army problems," and "Develop increased capability to manage men and things," serve to illustrate the emphasis these participants placed upon objectives concerning the development of specific skills. Consequently, the responses to question fifteen did not appear to challenge the validity of the participants' stated objectives.

Still another view of participants' objectives was attempted through use of a forced-choice question (Question 9)

which asked to what extent the participant was motivated by any intention of applying benefits derived from the Program to civilian pursuits. Forty-three per cent of the respondents said they had given no consideration to this as an influence in their motivation and another forty-six per cent claimed that they were only moderately influenced in this respect. Of the three participants who, in their stated objectives (in answer to question seven), specifically referred to the benefits of the Program in connection with retirement, only one had indicated (in answer to question 9) that he was strongly influenced by such a consideration. The other two respondents indicated that they were moderately influenced. Since these three participants were not eligible for retirement, in accordance with the terms of the obligated service agreement which they accepted prior to having attended the Program, there is no tangible evidence as to the strength of this influence on their retirement objectives. Particularly noteworthy, however, is the fact that not a single Army participant had retired from active duty up through the time participant questionnaires were submitted (late summer, 1964). The obligated service agreement, which requires all Army participants in the Advanced Management Program to remain on active duty for a period of at least four years upon completion of the Course, may be largely responsible for this record.

The fifteen participants of the 35th, 36th, and 37th AMP classes in 1959 and the first half of 1960, however, were free to retire by the time their questionnaires were submitted, yet they obviously had chosen not to do so. This, in itself, serves as an indication of the sincerity of response to the question on retirement benefits.

Finally, an attempt was made to establish a relationship between what the participant wanted from the Program and what he felt he actually gained as a result of his attendance. As previously explained, standard classifications were established for analyzing responses to questions seven and eight, which elicited this information, in the participants' questionnaire. Over fifty-six per cent of the statements of benefits realized from the Advanced Management Program, as expressed by individual Army participants, coincided with the classification of personal objectives which those respective participants claim to have established prior to their attending the Program. Also noteworthy is the fact that quite a consistent pattern was discerned in those instances where previously formulated personal objectives differed with what the participant thought he gained from the Program. In fifty per cent of these instances, participants formulated objectives of a professional nature but indicated that their benefits, after having completed the Program, were of a personal nature. For example, one participant stated his

objectives as "Improved ability, updating management approaches and techniques through refresher," yet, in answer to the question of what he thought happened to him as a result of having attended the Program, he answered, "Outside of such by-products as acquisition of new friends, perhaps the most meaningful result was a fresh realization of the value of the complete MBA course and the increased confidence in my ability compared to successful contemporaries in commerce and industry." Other discrepancies between objectives and gains were so widely varied as to make them of no particular significance.

Summary: In summary, the majority of Army participants, lacking more specific guidance from their sponsor, selected objectives of a professional nature and these objectives rarely changed during the progress of the Course. Almost half of the respondents indicated that they received no information about their sponsor's objectives, reasons for selection, expectations during or after the Course, etc., from their sponsor prior to attending the Program, but only about one-third of them expressed any desire to be so informed. Although most participants were primarily interested in the development of their reasoning and thought processes, this seemed consistent with their expression of personal objectives because of the general terminology used to describe those stated objectives in the professional category and of

the nature of objectives in the general category. Furthermore, the influence of any retirement benefits associated with the Program on personal objectives was negligible. Whereas this was confirmed by the total absence of retirements in the Army, the four year obligated service requirement imposed on all Army participants may have been instrumental in accounting for this situation. In addition, there was remarkable agreement between participants' personal objectives and what they felt they got out of the Program. Areas of disagreement were predominatly in disparities between objectives of a professional nature and benefits received of a personal nature. As a whole, the data on Army participants was consistent and meaningful.

Navy Participants

The personal objectives expressed by Navy participants disclosed a distinctly professional slant. Slightly less than forty-five per cent of the responses fell within the professional category - somewhat less than a majority as experienced in the Army response. The nature of those professional objectives, however, was quite similar to the pattern established by Army respondents - general and broad in scope, characterized by such statements as "Improve management ability." The intent to apply acquired management skills within the Navy complex was specifically mentioned several times but was implied even more frequently. Of the remaining responses,

about forty-five per cent were distributed almost evenly between the general and personal categories, a little less than ten per cent were of an ethical nature, with about two per cent falling in the analytical category. Most descriptive of the general category of objectives was the term "broadening" which was used in one form or another a total of thirteen times by participants in stating their objectives. Objectives in the personal category most frequently referred to acquisition of friends in the business world, while ethical objectives were primarily expressed as a concern for learning how to appreciate the feelings and actions of those in the business community.

There were no actual changes in stated personal objectives of participants during the course, but several respondents, in answer to the question about changes in objectives, did say that their interest and enthusiasm both in their own objectives and in the Course as a whole increased as they became more engrossed in the Program. In this respect, one participant, who claimed to have no definite objectives prior to attending the Program, did indicate that he developed "an increasing interest in comparing management problems in the Navy with those of civilian industry." This interest, incidently, subsequently led to a decision on the part of the participant to retire from the Navy and pursue a second career.

Almost seventy per cent of the Navy participants reported that they were told nothing, or practically nothing,

by their sponsors prior to their attendance at the Program. As previously pointed out under that section of this chapter dealing with Navy sponsors' communications with participants, this information is considerably at variance with most sponsors' beliefs that their candidates were properly and adequately briefed prior to attendance. Considering this apparent lack of communication, perhaps it was only coincidental that both sponsors' and participants' objectives were predominantly of the professional category. Navy sponsoring activities seem to have exerted very little influence in the formulation of the personal objectives of participants. The experience of Army participants in their selection of primarily professionally oriented personal objectives, especially in the face of such general objectives on the part of their sponsor, further substantiates this observation.

Only thirty-five per cent of the respondents who indicated that they were told nothing by their sponsor reported that they would like to have been told the reasoning behind their selection, what they were expected to get from the Course, and the type of positions to which they could expect to be assigned upon completion of the Program. The remaining respondents in this category generally did not elaborate on a negative answer, but one or two individuals stated that since attendance at the Advanced Management Program was widely recognized as a "prestige" assignment, it was unnecessary

for the sponsor to explain the meaning and significance of selection for participation in the Program.

Those relatively small numbers of Navy participants who acknowledged receipt of information from their sponsors prior to attending the Program generally confirmed what most sponsors claimed to have told their participants - why the participant was selected, what the objectives were in attending the Program, what might be expected of the individual upon completion, and the names of previous Navy participants. This information was generally considered by the participants to be adequate.

In response to the forced-choice question inquiring into the participant's primary concern for development of reasoning and thought processes, as opposed to the development of specific administrative skills, over seventy-two per cent of the Navy respondents said that they were primarily interested in developing their reasoning and thought processes. Although this reaction paralleled that of Army participants, the response was somewhat weaker. A review of the professional objectives advanced by Navy respondents, however, disclosed them to be expressed in even more general terms than those reported by the Army participants. In fact, only ten per cent of the Navy participants' professional objectives mentioned any specific skill acquisitions as compared with thirty per cent for the Army. The other ninety per cent of Navy respondents described professional objectives

as desires to "Increase management ability," "Improve management competence," "Acquire a better appreciation for the problems of business management," etc. Considering the fact that the development of specific administrative skills is more closely associated with objectives in the professional and analytical categories than in those of the general, personal, and ethical categories, and in view of the small number of analytical objectives (2%) cited by Navy participants, there appears to be an internal inconsistency between the response to this question on basic objectives and the freely expressed personal objectives of Navy participants. Furthermore, only thirty-seven per cent of those Navy respondents who said they were primarily interested in the development of specific administrative skills referred to any specific skills in their personal objectives. Those that did, cited objectives such as "Acquire an understanding of financial management," and "Gain an insight into labor relations." Even the analytical objectives were stated in non-specific terms. Not only is this data, therefore, internally inconsistent, but it is also inconsistent with similar data on Army and Air Force participants. As the number of professional and analytical objectives goes down, one might expect the response to development of reasoning and thought processes to go up, although this cannot be stated as a hard and fast rule because of variations in the expression of these objectives. Perhaps part of the inconsistency noted in the Navy data is the result of lack of specificity in stating objectives that

do not truly represent the participants' intent.

In still another attempt to more fully explore the personal objectives of Navy participants, a forced-choice question was asked in order to determine the degree to which the participant was motivated by any intention of using his attendance at the Program to enhance his retirement potential. The response to this question was surprising in several respects. Whereas retirement was mentioned only once in the personal objectives of Navy participants, almost one-third of the Navy respondents said that the intent of applying the benefits of the Program to civilian pursuits was a real consideration at the time of their selection for the Program. By comparison, only slightly more than ten per cent of the Army respondents said they had given Program benefits upon retirement any real consideration prior to attendance. This significant difference can probably be attributed to the fact that more Navy participants initiated the idea of attendance themselves (almost forty per cent versus a little less than fifteen per cent of Army participants). The implication is that numerous Navy participants initiated the idea of their attending the Program with the intent of utilizing, upon retirement, any benefits gained from their experience, but without indicating such intent in their personal objectives. Perhaps also, these participants were merely more candid in their response. In order to check these

suppositions and to help determine the significance of the response to this question on retirement objectives, a comparison was made between this response and the behavioral pattern of participants regarding retirement. Only two Navy participants had actually retired from active duty at the time of this study. What makes this information even more remarkable is that the Navy, unlike the Army, imposed no obligated service requirements upon participants after completion of the Program - they were eligible to submit their requests for retirement at any time.

Because of the extremely small population of retired Navy participants, an extensive analysis of their responses would have little validity. Several similarities of response, however, are interesting. Both participants said that they gave only moderate consideration to any intent to apply what they gained from the Program to civilian pursuits, even though one of them initiated the idea of attendance himself. Both men were considerably older than the average age of both their classmates and their military contemporaries but were favorably disposed to the Program, as evidenced by their own experiences, their reaction to the faculty, and their reaction to continuing military utilization of the Program. Particularly significant is their common belief that they were not given an opportunity, upon completion of the Course, to utilize most effectively what they had gained from their experience. One participant retired three years after

completion of the Program while the other, who decided to retire while attending the Program, did so almost immediately after completing the Course. In neither case was there any real evidence of retirement objectives prior to attendance.

The relationship between what a participant hoped to get out of the Program, as expressed by his personal objectives, and what he felt he actually gained from his experience bore a remarkable resemblance to that found in the case of Army participants. Using the same classifications of categories for both sets of data, an analysis disclosed that there was a fifty-nine per cent agreement between what a participant wanted and what he felt he got from the Program. In those instances where discrepancies existed between personal objectives and results achieved from the Program, a significant pattern emerged. Over fifty-eight per cent of these discrepancies were accounted for by participants who reported professional and general objectives prior to attending the Program but who claimed to have realized gains of a personal nature as a result of their attendance. The remaining discrepancies were so widely dispersed as to make them individually insignificant.

Summary: By way of summary, Navy participants expressed predominantly professional objectives described in rather general terms but which fairly well matched the objectives advanced by Navy sponsoring activities. This

appeared to be coincidental since, although most sponsors thought their respective participants were being well briefed prior to their attending the Program, about seventy per cent of the participants indicated that they had received little or no information from their sponsors. Furthermore, only thirty-five per cent of this group said they would like to be so informed. While personal objectives did not change, they were sometimes accentuated and strengthened during the progress of the Course. Almost three-quarters of the Navy respondents said that they were primarily interested in developing their reasoning ability and thought processes rather than in acquiring specific administrative skills. Even by rationalizing that the general terminology used by participants in describing practically all categories of their objectives was compatible with the broad basic objective of developing reasoning ability and thought processes, there were a number of identifiable inconsistencies in the responses of certain respondents. Whereas these internal inconsistencies were not too significant in themselves, they may point to the greater inconsistency which existed between Navy data and the Army and Air Force data. Despite the fact that over one-third of the Navy participants initiated the idea of their attending the Program and that roughly the same percentage acknowledged that they seriously considered the advantages of applying Program experiences to civilian pursuits, there

is little or no evidence that retirement was an objective in attending the Program. In fact, the relatively insignificant number of retirements, considering the lack of any restraining regulations, seems to substantiate this conclusion. Finally, an impressive correlation existed between the objectives Navy participants brought with them to the Program and what they claimed to have gained from the Program. Inconsistencies primarily involved initial objectives of a professional character opposed by derived benefits of a personal nature. With the exception of the discrepancy between responses to the question on development of reasoning and thought processes and the expression of freely stated personal objectives, this data on Navy participants appears to be internally consistent and basically in agreement with that on Army participants.

Air Force Participants

Air Force participant responses to the question regarding their personal objectives followed a pattern very much similar to that established by Army and Navy participants. While only forty per cent of the Air Force respondents' objectives were of a professional nature, this represented the largest single classification of response, followed by general and personal objectives which were expressed with equal frequency, each accounting for twenty-four per cent of the total response. Objectives classified as ethical and analytical, as usual, were rather insignificant in number, representing seven per cent and five per cent of responses

respectively. Similarities of response patterns pertained to qualitative characteristics as well as quantitative ones. For example, professional objectives were couched in very general language and frequently described in such broad terms as, "Desire to increase management know-how." "Broadening" was overworked for lack of more descriptive information, and most personal objectives were concerned with the associations and friendships to be cultivated by military participants with business leaders.

Only one Air Force respondent acknowledged any change in his objectives during the course. He expressed his professional objectives, prior to attending the Program, as gaining a better understanding of the management tools of big business, comparing the various aspects of business and military management, and being able to apply newly acquired management tools in his practice of military management. As the course progressed, however, this respondent claimed that he began to realize the broader aims of the Course. His interests expanded to the point where he found insufficient time to pursue his desired studies in addition to those prescribed in the Course. He did, nevertheless, find an opportunity, and the courage, to improve on his techniques of communication.

In order to determine what influence the sponsoring activities may have exerted on the formulation of personal objectives, Air Force participants were asked to indicate

what their sponsors told them after their selection for the Program but prior to their attendance. Sixty per cent indicated that they were told nothing, or practically nothing, by their sponsors despite the fact that two-thirds of the sponsors who returned their questionnaires claimed that their participants were briefed on why each person was chosen, what was expected of them, and how attendance at this Program would affect their careers. As previously pointed out in that section of this chapter dealing with Air Force sponsors' communication with participants, objectives were not discussed with participants. Note should be made, however, of the fact that, although the sponsors' stated objective is couched in very general terms, there is a professional slant indicated by reference to "a more effective executive in any management position." Perhaps the general terminology used in expressing the sponsors' objective was recognized by participants as being of little or no benefit, and may have influenced their negative response to the question inquiring as to what they had been told by their sponsors. The lack of specificity noted in the participants' personal objectives is probably not the result of any great degree of influence exerted by sponsors' objectives, however, especially considering (1) the high percentage of participants who reported that they were told nothing, (2) the generality which also characterized stated personal objectives of Army and Navy

participants, and (3) the widespread lack of specificity in most expressed objectives of non-military participants as observed by Professor Andrews in his study of executive development programs. By allowing for the natural tendency to lean toward objectives of a professional nature in justification for attendance at the Program, there is little evidence that Air Force sponsors exerted any significant amount of influence in the formulation of the personal objectives of their participants.

Fifty per cent of those participants who indicated that they were told nothing by their sponsor said they would like to have been informed of why they were selected, what they were expected to gain from the experience, and what effect attendance at the Program would have on their future in the Air Force. One officer, who obviously had strong feelings in this respect, said he would like to have been told why he was selected - that he still didn't know almost two years after having completed the Program. Most of the participants who acknowledged receipt of information from their sponsors prior to attending the Program described a wide variety of such information which generally included the material which Air Force sponsors claimed to have disseminated to their participants. Several respondents also mentioned that they were informed of the personal financial obligations which were likely to be incurred but for which they would not be reimbursed. Only one respondent felt that the information he received was inadequate. He said he was told what was

expected of him and the general level and methods of conducting the Course but that he would like to have been told more about where the Course might lead him in his military career since no plan was evident at the time.

When asked to choose between whether a participant was more interested in the development of his reasoning and thought processes as opposed to the development of specific administrative skills, over ninety-three per cent of the Air Force respondents said they were more interested in the former. The strength of this response was greater than that of Army and Navy respondents who were similarly inclined. This seems to support the position advanced during the discussion of Navy participants' data on this question which held that as the number of professional and analytical objectives decrease, there is a tendency for the response to development of reasoning and thought processes to increase. Although the Air Force respondents reported a greater number of analytical objectives than either the Army or Navy, the percentage of such objectives (5%) was so small that it lost significance in comparison with the number of professional objectives (40%) and thus had little influence on the outcome of this analysis. Also characteristic of the responses from participants of both the Air Force and the other two Services, was the general terminology used to express their objectives, including those classified as professional objectives. Furthermore, of only two Air Force respondents who said they were primarily

concerned with the development of specific administrative skills, only one expressed his personal objectives in specific terms and referred to any administrative skills. The numbers here involved are too small to be of any real significance but they certainly do not refute the evidence that the response to this question on basic objectives is substantially consistent with the freely stated objectives of Air Force participants and with similar data on Army participants in the Advanced Management Program.

Another approach to analysis of Air Force participants' personal objectives was arranged by asking each participant to what extent he was motivated by any intention of applying benefits gained from the Program to civilian pursuits. Almost thirteen per cent of the respondents indicated that they had given real consideration to the retirement benefits associated with attendance at the Advanced Management Program, yet nobody mentioned or referred to retirement in stating their individual personal objectives. The percentage of Air Force respondents who acknowledged giving real consideration to retirement benefits slightly exceeded that of Army participants (10%) but was far less than that of Navy participants (32%). Furthermore, over forty-five per cent of the Air Force respondents indicated that they had given no consideration to retirement benefits prior to attending the Program. These results are even more amazing in view of the fact that over half of the Air Force participants themselves initiated

the idea of their attendance. The obvious indication is that most Air Force participants wanted to attend the Program in order to improve their service careers with little concern or thought of personal gain for early retirement. The actions of these Air Force participants, however, seem to belie their professions. Contrary to expectations aroused from replies to the questions concerning personal objectives, and especially in consideration of the data on Army participants, a total of six Air Force participants covered by this study had retired from active duty as of the time participant questionnaires were returned (late summer, 1964). Five of these six retired participants responded to the questionnaire.

Although the population of retired respondents was small, a brief analysis of the data gathered from this group disclosed some interesting information from which several conclusions were drawn. Unlike the Navy retirees who were older than their peers, the Air Force retired participants ranged from 40 to 45 years of age (average 43.6 years) at the time of their attendance - making them generally younger than their Air Force contemporaries and considerably younger, on the average, than their contemporaries in the other two Services. Four of the five respondents said they initiated the idea of their attendance but only one indicated that he gave any real consideration to the retirement benefits associated with attending the Program. Furthermore, three of the respondents said they had given no consideration to retirement benefits prior to attendance. If these responses were

legitimate, and there was, prior to attendance, actually little or no intention of gaining retirement benefits, something may have happened during the Course that influenced decisions for retirement. Several observations occurred while pursuing this idea. All five respondents seemed favorably disposed toward the Program as evidenced by their description of what they thought they got out of the Program, by their evaluation of faculty effectiveness, by their recommendations for continued utilization of the Program for military officers, and by the general tone of their overall replies. Contrary to the assumption that perhaps retirement was precipitated because of the participant's resentment of his improper utilization after completing the Course, only two of the five respondents indicated that they thought they could have been used more effectively. Both of these officers offered remarks which more fully explained their reasons for resentment and eventual voluntary retirement. The other three officers, however, provided no clues as to any unusual circumstances which could have accounted for their retirement. Perhaps their answers with respect to objectives concerning retirement benefits were not very candid or perhaps personal problems required such action. The number of subjects is really too small to provide the base for any significant conclusions in this respect.

Even though the evidence of such a small population of retired participants is inconclusive with regard to

dissatisfaction about effective utilization of participants who have completed the Program, there is a strong and positive correlation between the Air Force's relatively large number of retired participants and its exceptionally high response in indicating that participants could be used more effectively upon completion of the Course. This might lead to the tentative conclusion that, although participants had no retirement objectives prior to attending the Program, dissatisfaction with assignments subsequent to the Program might have lead to voluntary retirements.

In examining the relationship between what a participant hoped to get out of the Program, expressed as personal objectives prior to attending, and what he felt he actually did get out of the Course, a pattern emerged which was very similar to that experienced in analyzing the data from Army and Navy participants. Again using the same standard for classifying responses, a fifty-eight per cent agreement was found between what Air Force participants claimed they wanted and what they thought they gained from the Program. Where achievements did not match previously expressed objectives, certain interesting patterns emerged. For example, fifty-five per cent of this discrepant group consisted of participants who initially indicated they were seeking objectives in the professional and general categories yet claimed to have experienced gains of a personal nature. On the other hand, eighteen per cent of the group described objectives in the personal category

but claimed to have realized gains of a professional nature. Other discrepancies between objectives and gains consisted of widely scattered combinations that were of no particular significance.

Summary: In summary, we find that Air Force participants slant their personal objectives more toward the professional category than any other but that most stated objectives, regardless of classification, are described in very general terms and, therefore, are rarely changed during the progress of the Course. Moreover, because of the very general nature of sponsors' objectives, very little guidance is offered participants in the formulation of their personal objectives. Although sixty per cent of the respondents indicated that they received no information from their sponsors concerning such things as reasons for selection, what was expected of them, how attendance at the Program would affect their career, etc., two-thirds of the responding sponsors claim to have briefed their participants regarding this information. Half of the participants who reported that they were told nothing indicated that they would like to have been informed about why they were selected and how the experience would affect their Service careers. Over ninety-three per cent of the respondents said they were primarily interested in developing their reasoning and thought processes. This response was considered consistent with freely expressed personal objectives because of the general terminology characterizing

most of those objectives, including those in the professional category. Despite the fact that only thirteen per cent of Air Force respondents indicated they gave any real consideration to retirement benefits connected with the Program prior to their attendance, and despite the lack of evidence that retirement benefits were present but unexpressed as personal objectives, the Air Force had, by far, a larger group of retired participants than either of the other two Services. This correlates closely with the high percentage of Air Force participants who were not satisfied that they were being utilized to best advantage upon completion of the Program and leads to the theory that dissatisfaction after completion of the Program may be the reason for the Air Force's high retirement experience rather than any intent on the part of a participant prior to attendance or of any influence during the Course that would precipitate retirement.

Finally, there was substantial agreement between the personal objectives established by participants prior to entering the Program and the benefits experienced from attendance as expressed by respondents. Instances of disagreement, in this respect, were predominantly situations where participants entered the Program with general and professional objectives but claimed to have received benefits of a personal nature. The data on Air Force participants appears to be internally consistent and, with the exception of the discrepancy noted in the analysis and description of the Navy data on

thought processes versus special skills, seems to be in basic agreement with that of the Army and Navy.

Recapitulation of Military Participants

There was an unmistakable tendency on the part of military participants in the Advanced Management Program to concern themselves with professionally oriented objectives despite the nature of objectives established and/or communicated by sponsoring agencies. Although this tendency toward professionalism was rather uniform between the Services, as shown in Table 3-a, it was inconsistent with the assumption that participants' personal objectives would reflect, somewhat proportionately, the nature of their sponsors' objectives.

Both Army and Air Force sponsors reported extremely general training objectives with the Army's objectives perhaps being the most general and lacking specific reference to any professional intent. The Navy sponsors, on the other hand, submitted training objectives which were predominantly professional. Yet, considering these facts, it seems obvious from Table 3-a that participants' objectives were not directly influenced by the training objectives of their sponsors.

TABLE 3-a

Classification of Military Participants' Personal Objectives
(Expressed as percentages of total response)

Category	Army	Navy	Air Force	Composite
Professional	51	44	40	45
General	20	22	24	22
Personal	23	23	24	23
Ethical	4	9	7	7
Analytical	2	2	5	3

This observation substantiates a previous suspicion that many of the sponsoring activities did not really have specific training objectives and that the training objectives furnished in response to the questionnaire to sponsors (except for those very general objectives appearing in Service Regulations) had not previously been formalized. Furthermore, the participants' consistent denials of receipt of information from sponsors is indicative of either a faulty internal communication system or the feeling by participants that the generality of objectives expressed in widely disseminated regulations did not constitute receipt of information from their sponsor of the type that would be helpful in explaining the significance of their participation in a graduate training program.

As a result of analyzing the data from military participants, and in explanation of the predominantly professional nature of their personal objectives, a theory is advanced to the effect that a great many participants felt

compelled to adopt professional objectives. This compulsion, even in the face of the most general of sponsors' objectives, stems from the belief on the part of many participants that they are being sent to the Advanced Management Program in order to develop or strengthen their management ability in order that they will be in a position to successfully discharge increasingly more responsible positions in military management. The generally-expressed Air Force's objectives, in fact, tend to convey this intention. Moreover, the general nature of professional qualifications involved in preparation for this ultimate objective may help explain the general terms consistently used to express personal objectives of even a professional nature. It was probably because of this lack of specificity and the all encompassing general terminology with which participants' objectives were expressed, that very few respondents indicated any change in their personal objectives during the Program. Of course, one should not forget that the participants in this study, in responding to such an unstructured question as, "What did you hope to get out of the Program?", and in being asked to recall such information as of the time prior to their attendance at the Program, are going to be influenced both by fading recollections caused by the lapse of time and by the natural tendency to advance euphonious objectives.

It should be pointed out at this time, however, that the theory about why military participants predominantly

report professional type benefits does not support the logic of Professor Andrews' findings on non-military participants which led him to conclude that the older a man is the less likely he is to claim professional and personal gains and the more likely he is to cite ethical and analytical benefits from his program. Military participants were, on the average, two and one-half years older than their non-military contemporaries, with considerable numbers of them ranging in age from their late forties to the early fifties. The reasons for this discrepancy, in addition to those discussed, seem to be attributable to the characteristics, background, and training of the two groups of participants which will be examined more closely later in this chapter.

The participants' widespread denial of receipt of information from their sponsors concerning why they were selected for training, what was expected of them as a result of such training, how attendance at the Program would affect their career patterns, etc., is generally inconsistent with the reports from most sponsoring activities stating that their participants are briefed prior to attending the Program. The most gross inconsistency existed in Navy data where seventy per cent of the participants indicated that they were told nothing, yet the Navy sponsoring activities were the most spontaneous and specific not only in stating training objectives but in asserting that their participants were briefed

on matters concerning their association with the Program. Possible reasons for this inconsistency were noted earlier in this section. An important issue concerning the matter of communications between participants and their sponsors, however, developed from this analysis.

A substantial number (a little better than 38%) of those participants who claim that they were told nothing by their sponsor, stated that they would like to have been told about the significance of their selection. In some instances, it seemed that the respondent was aware of the prestige associated with his selection but would just like to have been reassured by his sponsor that this assignment was in recognition of his past performance and his future potential. There were sometimes unexpressed disappointments in not having been accorded this courtesy.

The response to a question asking participants for a choice between whether their primary concern was to develop reasoning ability and thought processes or to develop specific administrative skills was rather erratic. The purpose of the question was to further explore the underlying motives for participation in the Program and to check the consistency of the response mentioned above with the freely expressed personal objectives of participants. After initially reviewing the combined data, a theory was developed to the effect that the participant's inclination toward development of reasoning

and thought processes would increase as the number of his professional and analytical type objectives decreased. The reasoning behind this theory was that those participants who expressed personal objectives of a professional and analytical nature were more inclined to describe their objectives in more specific terms and, therefore, were more frequently inclined to be seeking proficiency in specific administrative skills whereas those who chose general, personal, and ethical type objectives described these objectives in more general terms and tended to favor broader interests as opposed to specific skills. This theory did not hold up, however, when subjected to the data compiled from all three Services, as shown by a comparison of the figures contained in Tables 3-a and 3-b.

TABLE 3-b

Response to Question 15 on Developing Thought Processes vs. Special Skills
(Expressed as percentages of total response)

	Reasoning and Thought Processes	Specific Administrative Skills
Army	81	19
Navy	72	28
Air Force	93	7

Despite the plurality of professional objectives (Table 3-a) which, according to this theory, would seem to

indicate a substantial concern for development of specific administrative skills, military participants strongly expressed their primary concern for development of their reasoning and thought processes (Table 3-b). Although some consistency was evident between Army and Air Force responses which showed that as professional objectives decreased, concern for reasoning and thought processes increased, the response from Navy participants was inconsistent with the rest of the data and, therefore, cast still further doubt upon the validity of the theory itself.

In addition to the possibility of lack of specificity on the part of participants in stating objectives which did not really represent their intent, and the possibility of human error in making a selection, there is always the psychological consideration which must be recognized. As a result of personal interviews with a number of military participants, it became evident that some of them based their responses, indicating concern for development of their thought processes, on reasoning that, since development of specific skills carried a connotation of narrowness and of getting involved in administrative details, their image would be enhanced by asserting their desire to develop an ability to think about the broader issue commensurate with grasping the "big picture" so often associated with higher levels of management. On the basis of this sample, it is suspected that other participants reacted in much the same manner. The

correlation between data on this issue with that on stated personal objectives of participants was interesting but not conclusive.

Another attempt at eliciting and validating information concerning personal objectives from military participants involved an inquiry into how retirement benefits associated with attendance at the Program influenced the formulation of participants' objectives. A reasonably strong correlation was anticipated, within any particular Service group, between a heavy response indicating that retirement benefits were a real consideration in influencing participants' attendance at the Program, and the number of retired participants. This, of course, would not be conclusive since a participant could have seriously considered the retirement advantages but have had no intention of taking advantage of them in the immediate or near future. Further complicating this issue was the effect of the disparity in the three Services' policies regarding obligated service of participants after their completion of the Program. Whereas the Army required four years, the Navy required no obligated service and the Air Force required thirty-nine weeks (three weeks service for every week spent in school). After analyzing the data from participants of all three Services, a confusing pattern was established. As shown in Table 3-c, there was an inverse relationship in the Navy and Air Force Groups between the percentage of

TABLE 3-c

Consideration of Retirement Benefits vs. Actual Retirements

	Degree of Consideration			Actual Number of Retired Participants
	Real	Moderate	None	
Army	11%	46%	43%	0
Navy	32%	42%	26%	2
Air Force	13%	42%	45%	6

participants who acknowledged having given real consideration to retirement benefits and those who actually retired. Furthermore, whereas forty-five per cent of the Air Force participants said they had given no consideration to retirement benefits, this group produced the highest number of retirees. A closer examination of the seven retired participants who responded to the questionnaire established no meaningful patterns of behavior from which significant conclusions could be drawn. There was no evidence of deceit or of the formulation of any retirement objectives prior to a participant's attendance at the Program. Four of the seven respondents (two Navy and two Air Force) did indicate, however, that they did not feel they were utilized to best advantage after having completed the Program. In pursuing this lead, it was interesting to note that the Air Force, with the largest number of retirees, had by far the largest number of participants who felt that they could have been more effectively utilized subsequent to completing their advanced

management training. The implication is, of course, that even if participants had no retirement objectives prior to attending the Program, subsequent duty assignments and the relative effectiveness of the utilization of their training experiences may play a key part in influencing their decisions to retire. This issue, however, will be discussed with greater detail in Chapter Four.

Although the data generated in response to the question on retirement benefits attendant with the Program was interesting, it was not very conclusive. Mention should be made, nevertheless, of the human tendency toward creating favorable impressions and, even though the anonymity of respondents was emphasized in order to increase candor, participants may have tempered their reply to the question on retirement benefits because of the moral implication of exploiting an opportunity to attend school for the opportunism of personal gain in retirement.

In the comparative analysis between what a military participant hoped to get out of the Advanced Management Program, as freely expressed in his personal objectives, and what he felt he actually gained from the Program, a consistent and significant pattern of response was evident. Table 3-d shows the remarkably similar results obtained from all three Services. This correlation substantiates that portion of the hypothesis expressed at the beginning of this chapter

TABLE 3-d

Correlation of Personal Objectives and Program Benefits

	Per Cent Agreement
Army	56
Navy	59
Air Force	58

which stated that "The degree of benefit to both the Service and individual participant. . . is closely related to. . . the sense of purpose in attending the program." A majority of the instances where pre-attendance objectives did not match benefits received were characterized by individuals who listed general or professional type objectives yet who claimed to have received benefits of a personal nature. Directly comparable data is not available for non-military participants in the Advanced Management Program, but Professor Andrews, in his study of executive development programs, did compile data on what non-military participants thought they got out of the Program. In order to insure comparability of data, the question included in the questionnaire to military participants was identical to the one Andrews included in his questionnaire, and the same standards for classification and analysis of response were used. The results of this comparison appear in Table 3-e.

TABLE 3-e

Benefits Received from Attendance at the Advanced Management Program
(Expressed as percentages of total response)

Category	Military	Non-Military
Professional	26	21
General	18	15
Personal	38	26
Ethical	3	17
Analytical	7	14
No Answer	8	7

A few remarks may be in order concerning the two categories of benefits showing the greatest spread - ethical and personal.

There were no perceptible clues in the responses of military participants as to why references to benefits of an ethical nature were so infrequent. One factor which might possibly have influenced military participants to be less conscious of ethical matters, in expressing reactions as to what they gained from attendance at the Program, is the deep-rooted training and practice of military custom and discipline where rules of conduct are fairly well defined and a great deal of emphasis has constantly been placed on all aspects of personal leadership. This leadership training involves concentration on matters such as consideration for others, responsibilities of command, moral obligations, etc., to the point where Program discussions of principles related to these

issues might not have the profound effect on the military that might be expected of individuals who have been less constantly and consistently oriented in this direction. Furthermore, the diversity of experiences occasioned by frequent changes of jobs and environments, together with the necessity for a variety of personal relationships with both military and non-military personnel in the course of a military career, may well have required a broadening of the military concept of ethical values which could render experiences in this respect, while attending the Program, less critical to the military participant in his overall evaluation of the Program.

The pronounced tendency for many military participants to initially select general and professional type objectives, yet claim to have received benefits of a personal nature from the Program, has already been noted. Many of the participants who were responsible for establishing this behavioral pattern, plus a majority of those who initially listed pre-attendance objectives of a personal nature, said they were interested in making new friends and acquaintances among the more successful leaders in the business world. For many military participants, this was a unique opportunity for them to associate with non-military executives of such high caliber. One of the more significant results of this association was the realization, on the part of many of the military respondents, that they were equally as competent as

their non-military contemporaries and some felt that they were a great deal more competent.

From the above discussion, the greatest differences between benefits received from military as opposed to non-military participants seemed to stem from the training, background, and experiences of the two groups more than from the manner of expressing their benefits, from misunderstandings of what was intended, or from age, years of service, etc. Furthermore, Professor Andrews, in his study, found that a high percentage of participants from government positions reported benefits of a personal nature, whereas only a very small percentage indicated receiving any ethical benefits.[2]

Concluding Summary

In conclusion, it becomes obvious that neither the training institution, the sponsoring activities, nor the individual military participants have overcome the tendency toward generality and lack of specificity found to be so characteristic in formulating training objectives. On the basis of the somewhat more specific comments stated by some of the sponsoring activities, however, in response to the question about what changes were expected in participants, there was reason to believe that sponsors' objectives could be made more specific. Nevertheless, the extreme generality

---

[2] Kenneth R. Andrews, The Effectiveness of University Management Programs. (Unpublished manuscript, Harvard University, 1964), p. V-53.

of Army and Air Force sponsors' objectives and the questionable effectiveness of the dissemination of all sponsors' objectives to participants makes it difficult, if not impossible, to determine the amount and direction of influence exercised by sponsors on participants in the formulation of their personal objectives. On the basis of several isolated observations from respondents who chose to identify themselves, plus a series of personal interviews touching on this issue, there was indication that participants did or would consider their sponsor's objectives, however, in formulating their own personal objectives. This, although sketchy and inconclusive, together with the high positive correlation between participants' objectives and benefits, tends to substantiate, within the means of available data, the general hypothesis stated at the beginning of this chapter. There is reason to believe, therefore, that if sponsoring activities would seriously consider, formulate, and update specific training objectives and effectively disseminate such objectives to their participants as an aid in preparing them to attend the Advanced Management Program, that the results of such training could be more beneficial to both the sponsor and the participant.

One further point, although touched upon before, warrants comment here because it was mentioned by representatives of several of the military sponsors during personal interviews, in the course of personal interviews with

participants, and in one or two of the questionnaires returned by participants who felt very strongly about the subject. This was the objective, unexpressed by any of the sponsors in their replies to questionnaires, that military participation in the Advanced Management Program should have a twofold purpose. One obvious purpose was to help the participant improve his management ability and to help him grow in preparation for top management positions of increasing responsibility. The other was to send participants who could make a significant contribution to the Program and enhance military prestige in the eyes of business leaders. Reports from questionnaires and interviews alike have testified to the relative success in achieving both purposes in the above objective.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF FACTORS INFLUENCING IMPACT

In this chapter some of the factors which have been instrumental in influencing the impact experienced by military personnel who have attended the Harvard Advanced Management Program will be identified, analyzed, and discussed. These factors will be treated individually and the analysis will take the form of examining the data from each military service, summarizing a military position with regard to each factor, and, wherever applicable, comparing the military information with data compiled by Professor Andrews and others, on non-military personnel who have been influenced by identical factors.

From a review of the literature on evaluation of management development training, certain patterns of behavior have been noted and several hypotheses have been established for the factors which will be discussed in this chapter. Conclusions will be advanced, to the maximum extent possible, to explain or reconcile differences between these patterns and hypotheses and the data gathered from military participants.

Optimum Length of Program

The very nature of this study on military participants in the Harvard Advanced Management Program limited the scope

of coverage on this factor concerning length of the Program. Since most respondents did not have the benefit of a similar experience at another training institution, replies to the question, "How do you feel about the length of the Program?" had to be based on a rather subjective evaluation of the Harvard Program alone. Participants, as a rule, formed their opinions and expressed their feelings from an evaluation of how pertinent the material was to their needs and how effectively their time was utilized.

Army

Eighty-three per cent of the Army respondents thought that the Course was about right in length. Of the seventeen per cent who were critical, all were of the opinion that the Course was too long. The majority of these critics thought that ten weeks would have been the optimum length of the Program. The most common reason cited for reducing the time devoted to advanced management training was that of redundancy. Most respondents felt that interest and enthusiasm waned after about ten weeks and that the last several weeks were rather unproductive. In fact, one respondent even said that "The administration seemed to be looking for subjects to include near the end of the Course." Another thought that retaining the last several weeks of the Program would be warranted only if more subject material were added - he suggested a course on automatic data processing.

Navy

Navy participants were more critical than those of the other two Services concerning length of the Program. Twenty-three per cent of the Navy respondents thought the Course should be either longer or shorter than the thirteen weeks which was allocated. By far the majority (seventy-one per cent) of these respondents felt that the Course was too long. They suggested optimum lengths of from nine to twelve weeks but most thought that ten weeks would be about right. Reasons for shortening the Course included, primarily, the loss of interest around the tenth week and a decrease in effectiveness during the last several weeks. There was a feeling that, toward the end, the Course lacked the fascination and stimulation which characterized the first ten weeks. One person expressed the opinion that the same material could have been covered in ten weeks instead of thirteen weeks with no loss of effectiveness. Another respondent more specifically criticized the administration by his statement that "Better planning by the school could do a better job." Others added that thirteen weeks was just too long to be away from their jobs and their families.

In contrast to those who considered the Program too long, was a minority of critics who felt that, in order to be more effective, the Program should be lengthened. One respondent suggested sixteen weeks (one full college semester) in order to permit more latitude for individual reading and

research, while another went so far as to suggest five months in order to create enough time for individual case studies.

We must not lose sight of the fact, however, that, despite the attention given to the critical remarks described above, seventy-seven per cent of all the Navy respondents seemed happy with the length of their Program and said they thought it was "about right."

Air Force

Only three Air Force respondents (ten per cent) thought the Program should have been shorter or longer than it was. Within this small number, however, existed the widest spread of opinions advanced by any of the military participants. Of the two respondents who thought the Program should be shortened, one suggested that the Course could be cut to as short as eight weeks, while the other felt it could be reduced to not more than twelve weeks in length. They pointed out that, in their opinions, there was a general decline in interest, application, cooperation, and meaningful effort toward the end of the Course and that this reaction was experienced by military and non-military alike. They felt that the Course could be shortened by streamlining and better planning.

The only Air Force respondent who thought that the Program was too short suggested an optimum length of one year. He felt that some of the subjects were treated too

superficially. Further analysis of this extreme position disclosed that the respondent had completed only two years of college (one of the five military respondents from all three Services who had less than four years of college), had attended no other civilian or Service schools during his Service career, and had retired one year after having completed the Program. This situation suggests the probability of a feeling of inadequate academic preparadness on the part of the respondent who appears to have considered the Advanced Management Program as some sort of a substitute for more extensive formal education. This respondent's background and ideas are certainly not typical of other Air Force participants, ninety per cent of whom considered the length of the Program to be appropriate.

Composite

Most military participants, as shown in Table 4-a,

Table 4-a

Participant Appraisal of Length For
Harvard Advanced Management Program
(Expressed as percentages of response)

Program was:	Army	Navy	Air Force	Composite
Too Short	0	7	3	3
About Right	83	77	90	84
Too Long	17	16	7	13

thought that thirteen weeks was about the right length for the Advanced Management Program. Those who thought that the Program was too long complained of, or implied, redundancy. They felt that by better planning and administration, the Course could be reduced to about ten weeks and that this would tend to sustain the interest and enthusiasm which

carried through most of the rest of the Program but which waned during the final two or three weeks of the present thirteen week course. There was also indication of concern about being away from both the job and the family, especially if the participant felt that the Program was not consistently vital and productive through to the very end. A review of the entire questionnaire of those who thought the Course was too long did not reveal any unusual personal characteristics or any internal inconsistencies. The attitudes of these respondents toward the Program were generally favorable and responses seemed to be well considered and lucidly expressed. The small number of respondents who felt the Program was too short were considered to be of little overall significance.

The Harvard Advanced Management Program is one of the longest executive development programs sponsored by universities. Attendant with the increased length of any such program is the problem of maintaining student interest and enthusiasm. The fact that only thirteen per cent of the military participants felt that the Harvard Program was too lengthly and that most of the respondents who felt that way suggested shortening the Program by only three weeks, is testimony, in itself, to the favorable reaction of military participants. This favorability was further demonstrated by answers and reactions to questions throughout the participants' questionnaires - the overwhelmingly favorable reaction to the faculty's teaching effectiveness (a very

critical feature of longer programs), the practically unanimous expression of belief in the superiority of the Harvard course over a similar type military-sponsored course conducted exclusively for military personnel, and the overall favorable tone of general response to the questions in the questionnaire. The favorability with which the Harvard Program was received takes on even more significance in view of Professor Andrews' observation that the length of a program affects the seriousness with which its favorability should be considered - the favorability of longer programs being more significant.[1]

The issue of long versus short programs has been studied and discussed extensively in the literature concerning executive development training. Although Gorsuch found "that there seems to be a relationship between the program's length and its efficacy in changing the basic attitudes and values of the participants which makes the trend toward shorter programs disturbing,"[2] McKay pointed out that, from his study, it was impossible to establish that longer programs definitely resulted in significantly greater impact than shorter ones.[3] He did conclude, nevertheless, that longer programs tended to result in greater impact.

---

1 Kenneth R. Andrews, The Effectiveness of University Management Programs (Unpublished manuscript, Harvard University, 1964), p. V-62.

2 John H. Gorsuch, "Executive Growth. Making Better Use of University Programs," Business Horizons, 6,(Spring 1963), 57-62.

3 Quinn G. McKay, The Impact of University Executive Development Programs on Participating Executives (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1960), p. 128.

Although the impact of the Harvard Program on military participants appeared to be strong as well as favorable, one must bear in mind the human tendancy to favorably represent past training experiences when relating the benefits of this experience to others. This tendancy sometimes increases with time. In addition, there is often a feeling among participants that they are expected to gain more and change more as a result of having attended a longer training program, and this may also have served to bias the data received. Despite such influence of degree, however, there was an unmistakably favorable impact realized from what appeared to the participants to be an executive development program of just about optimum length. This generally favorable reaction paralleled that of non-military participants in the Program.

Preferred Course Content

The preferences participants have for courses taught in an executive development program should reflect, at least to some extent, their objectives in attending that program and their needs as they perceive them. Consequently, this factor of influence on impact ties in with, and will be a further elaboration of, the material concerning objectives which was discussed in Chapter Three.

Basically, participants were asked to express, via questionnaire, their reactions to the courses taught in the

Harvard Advanced Management Program and to indicate whether the expression of their interest was a reflection of the way the different subjects were taught or of their basic interest in the subject. The answers to these questions were then compared for consistency with the response to the question asking whether the participant was primarily concerned with the development of his reasoning and thought processes or with the development of specific administrative skills.

Another approach to determining, on a much broader scale, a preference for course content was attempted through the use of two questions concerned more with the type of course rather than specific subject matter. One question (Question 17) inquired as to whether the participant thought he would have benefited more from a military-sponsored course in executive development attended exclusively by military personnel. The other question (Question 18a) asked the participant to compare the Advanced Management Program with a senior military training program, such as the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, and indicate which one he would recommend for military officers to attend if a choice were necessary between the two types of courses.

The analysis of information generated in answer to the above questions was expected to shed some light on the nature of the influence on impact exerted by participant

preferences for course type and content. Furthermore, Professor Andrews, in his study of thirty-nine university executive development programs, found that most participants were interested in non-functional subject matter.[4] In the belief that this observation also holds true for military participants, the following hypothesis is advanced on the basis of Andrews' findings.

> Hypothesis: Military participants in an executive development program express the greatest interest in non-functional subject matter of presumably equal value to all executives aspiring to senior management positions regardless of their specialized training, background, and experience.

This hypothesis will be tested during the process of the analysis which follows.

Army

Army participants in the Advanced Management Program showed a decisive preference for non-functional subjects. They indicated the greatest interest in a course titled Business and the World Society, followed by Administrative

---

4 Kenneth R. Andrews, "Reaction to University Development Programs," Harvard Business Review, 39, (No. 3), (May-June 1961), 116-134.

Practices and Business Policy. The least popular course was Accounting and Finance. Several respondents volunteered the information that they considered the Accounting and Finance course to be too detailed in content with a resulting loss in effectiveness. Wide differences in the background and experiences of participants materially influenced their reaction to this course - more so than in those more popular courses dealing with broader issues of a non-functional nature.

Almost ninety per cent of those respondents who expressed the nature of their interest in courses, indicated that their decisions on course preferences were primarily influenced by their basic interest in the subject rather than the manner in which the various courses were taught. Several of these respondents were not too sure of how much influence the instructor had on their interest but felt that they basically brought their interest in the subject with them to the Program. Seventeen per cent of the respondents failed to answer the question, however, either because of inability to understand it or because of an indecisiveness in determining the nature of their interest. From the "on balance" tone and content of several replies, the latter seems to be a more appropriate assumption.

The fact that eighty-one per cent of Army respondents indicated that they were chiefly concerned with the development

of their reasoning and thought processes rather than with the acquisition of specific administrative skills would seem to corroborate the response of participants who have predominantly indicated a preference for non-functional courses.

In response to a more general inquiry as to the preferred nature of a course in executive development, ninety-four per cent of the Army participants indicated that they would be opposed to attending a military-sponsored executive development course, designed exclusively for military personnel, in lieu of attendance at the Harvard Advanced Management Program. However, only twenty-six per cent of those who responded to a question asking for a preference between a senior military course, such as the Industrial College of the Armed Forces (not necessarily limited to management development per se), and the Harvard Program, said that they would recommend sending military officers to the Harvard Program rather than to a senior military program. The reasoning behind this latter response was in no way the result of dissatisfaction with the Harvard Program on the part of participants, but rather a feeling that military programs were generally longer and more directly applicable to the specific and immediate needs peculiar to military management. Many Army participants thought that forcing a decision was

unrealistic because of the diversity of the two types of programs.

Navy

Navy participants, like their Army contemporaries, indicated a strong preference for subjects of a non-functional nature. Their most popular courses were Business and the World Society, Administrative Practices, and Business Policy, in that order. These were identical to the courses, and the order of ranking, selected by Army participants. The course having least appeal to Navy participants was the highly functional Accounting and Finance. Comments from respondents disclosed that this course lacked a base of common knowledge. It was too elementary for some and too advanced for others, depending upon their prior experience, and was therefore rather ineffective for both groups.

Of those who chose to answer question fourteen, inquiring as to what influenced the respondents' expression of interest, eighty-nine per cent said they were influenced more by their basic interest in the subject than by the way in which the course was taught. Certain participants indicated some indecision and difficulty in attempting to answer this question, so it was not surprising to find that thirteen per cent of the Navy respondents failed to answer. The evidence was strong, nevertheless, that the basic interest

brought by the participant to the Program was most instrumental in influencing his selection of those courses which commanded his greatest interest and that this interest was not radically changed by the manner in which the course was taught.

Tending to confirm the indication of participants' preferences for courses of a non-functional nature was the large number of Navy respondents' statements to the effect that they were primarily concerned with the development of their reasoning ability and thought processes rather than of acquiring any specific administrative skills. In fact, seventy-two per cent of the Navy respondents expressed this concern. Although certainly not conclusive, this data is at least internally consistent with that which indicates a preference, by Navy participants, for broad-based, generally-oriented course material which is non-functional in approach and content.

Navy participants were unanimous in asserting their beliefs that they would not have benefited more from a military-sponsored executive development course designed to accommodate military personnel exclusively. Several respondents felt so strongly on this point that they punctuated their replies to the forced-choice question, "Do you think you would have benefited more from a military-sponsored course in

executive development attended exclusively by military personnel?" by comments such as, "Hell no," "Definitely not," and "By all means no." Furthermore, two-thirds of those who responded to question 18a, asking for the participants' choice between a senior military program and the Harvard Program, indicated that they would be in favor of sending military officers to the Advanced Management Program rather than to a military course such as the Industrial College of the Armed Forces if such a choice of alternatives was necessary. Many of the Navy respondents who favored a military program did so because they considered such programs to be specifically tailored to military needs and, therefore, of more direct application to the participant. There was evidence, however, of a certain amount of uneasiness, on the part of respondents, in being forced to make what they considered to be a difficult choice between the two types of courses.

Air Force

The pattern established by Air Force participants in expressing course preferences in the Advanced Management Program was almost identical to that of Army and Navy participants. The course in Business and the World Society led in popularity, followed by Business Policy and Administrative Practices, in that order. Again, following the same pattern, the least popular course was Accounting and Finance,

primarily because of the detail involved and the lack of common types of student interest in the subject. There was, needless to say, a pronounced tendency for Air Force participants to favor non-functional courses.

Although most (seventy-eight per cent) Air Force respondents who voiced an opinion indicated that their expression of interest in various courses was primarily a reflection of their basic interest in the subject rather than an aroused interest resulting from the way in which the course was taught, the feelings in this respect were apparently not as strong as with participants from the Army and Navy. The Air Force had twice as many participants as the other two Services who felt that their interest in course material was significantly influenced by the manner in which the course was taught. Others (thirteen per cent) seemed to be torn between the two choices and were either unable to decide or were unwilling to express their decision.

Air Force participants were almost unanimous in expressing their principal concern for development of their reasoning and thought processes as opposed to the learning of specific administrative skills. This logically supported and helped confirm the conclusions drawn from other Air Force data to the effect that participants prefer courses of a non-functional nature.

Only one Air Force participant indicated that he thought he would have benefited more from a military-sponsored

executive development course attended exclusively by military personnel than from his course at Harvard, but he qualified his answer by adding the word "possibly." As opposed to this single response, which showed signs of uncertainty, all of the other Air Force participants favored attendance at the Harvard Program. Feelings were so strong on this point that four or five respondents added notes of emphasis to their answer on whether or not they would have preferred to attend a military executive development program - "Absolutely not," "Definitely no," and an emphatic underscoring of the word "No." One participant indicated that he spoke from experience by adding a note saying that he had subsequently attended such a military course and definitely favored the Advanced Management Program. In contrast to this strong response, replies were less dynamic and positions seemed less firm in answer to the question asking participants to choose between sending military officers to a senior military program, such as the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, and sending them to the Advanced Management Program. Although two-thirds of those who answered the question chose the Advanced Management Program, a great deal of concern seemed to exist about the difficulty of making a decision and the individual participants' qualifications for making such judgements. This appeared to be the main reason why

twenty-two per cent of the respondents failed to answer the question. Those in favor of military programs thought such programs were more responsive to the individual needs and career opportunities of military participants.

Composite

When military participants rated the degree of their personal interest in the various courses included in the Harvard Advanced Management Program, a remarkably similar pattern emerged from all three Services. This pattern, as can be seen from Table 4-b, except for the course in Business History, showed a strong preference , on behalf of military participants,

TABLE 4-b

Ratings of Personal Interest
in Advanced Management Program Courses

Courses	Army	Navy	Air Force	Military Composite	Non-Military
Administrative Practices	5.0	5.1	4.8	5.0	5.3
Labor Relations	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.8
Business and the World Society	5.2	5.2	5.5	5.3	5.3
Marketing	4.2	4.3	4.5	4.3	3.9
Business Policy	4.9	4.9	5.3	5.0	5.3
Accounting and Finance	3.9	4.0	4.1	4.0	4.7
Business History	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.2	-*

*Course not offered during the time non-military participants included in this study attended the Program.

for areas of study which were non-functional in nature. Since course preference did not seem to depend upon the popularity of the professor, however, and because of the low rating of the course in Business History, there appeared to be something other than the non-functional aspect of the course which influenced personal interest. This might well be the subject for further research. Nevertheless, the fact that three out of four of the non-functional courses were strongly favored by military participants, and that all functionally-oriented courses were considerably less popular, would tend to support the hypothesis advanced at the beginning of the discussion of this factor of Preferred Course Content. Furthermore, this pattern of preference for non-functional subject matter persisted despite the extreme heterogeneity not only of officers from different branches of the Services, but also of officers of diversified training, background, and experience within the line and staff organizations of each Service. It does not, however, seem to be peculiar to military participants.

In comparing the military data with similar non-military data collected by Professor Andrews, and by using the same scales and system for weight-averaging responses, there appeared to be very little difference in the pattern of responses concerning degrees of participants' personal interests. It is evident from Table 4-b that non-military

participants also prefer courses which are not functionally oriented. One interesting deviation, however, between the preferences of military versus non-military participants is their reaction to the Marketing and the Accounting and Finance courses. Whereas both groups of participants rated these courses low in interest, military men rated Accounting and Finance lower than Marketing on their scale of interest and significantly lower than did non-military participants. This appeared somewhat unusual in light of the ever increasing emphasis being placed upon financial control responsibilities within the Department of Defense. Considering the many adverse references made by military participants to the detail and unwieldy nature of the Accounting and Finance course, perhaps the way in which the course was taught had more influence on individual interest than was realized by participants.

In considering this issue of whether a participant's expression of interest in a course of study was more a reflection of his basic interest in the subject or a reflection of the way in which the course was taught, a consistent and strong response developed from military participants. This response to question fourteen in the questionnaire to participants is shown in Table 4-c where it is matched with the comparable response of non-military participants to the same question. The military response is relatively level between the three

Table 4-c

Source of Participant Interest in Courses in the Advanced Management Program
(Expressed as percentages)

	Army	Navy	Air Force	Military composite	Non-Military
Way in Which Taught	9	10	19	13	22
Basic Interest in Subject	74	77	68	73	49
No Answer	17	13	13	14	29

Service groups but, although it follows the same basic pattern, it differs significantly in magnitude from the response of non-military participants. Military personnel seemed to experience some indecision and difficulty in formulating an acceptable answer to this question. For some it was hard, in retrospect, to determine how and to what degree, their interest in various subjects was influenced at the time of their attendance at the Program. Perhaps this accounted for some of the failures to answer but, if so, the non-military participants must have experienced even greater difficulty, judging from the percentage of "no answers" from that group. Nevertheless, it seems rather clear that military participants felt more strongly than their non-military counterparts that their pronounced interest in broad, non-functional subjects stemmed primarily from basic interests which they

brought with them to the Program rather than from the way in which the courses were taught, even though the method and quality of instruction did, many times, tend to influence their interest.

There is evidence, from the replies to other realted questions in the questionnaire to participants, of consistency of data which tends to strengthen and validate the conclusion that military participants are predominantly interested in non-functional subject matter with broad coverage and general application to all potential top level managers. For example, eighty-two per cent of the military respondents reported that they were primarily interested in developing their reasoning ability and thought processes rather than in acquiring specific administrative skills. (Table 3-b shows a breakdown of this response by Service group.) The implication here is that military participants are basically looking for broad coverage of general issues as viewed by top level management instead of increased proficiency in detailed operations.

On a much broader scale, and considering the nature and content of the entire program, as opposed to each individual subject taught, a relationship was drawn between a participant's interest in a broadly oriented top level management development program aimed at the process of management as opposed to a more specifically-oriented management development program designed to accommodate only military personnel. Table 4-d shows the strong feelings of military participants who emphatically stated that they would be opposed to attending a military-sponsored executive development course

designed exclusively for military personnel as a substitute for the Harvard Advanced Management Program.

Table 4-d

Armed Services Preference for Harvard AMP
Over a Military-Sponsored Executive Development Program
for Military Personnel Exclusively
(Expressed as percentages of response)

Service Group	Per Cent
Army	94
Navy	100
Air Force	97
Composite	97

Going one step further in extending the military participants' reactions to course content, an even wider choice was tendered for consideration. Given a choice, in question 18a of their questionnaire, between the Advanced Management Program and a senior military program, such as the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, military participants were hard pressed for a decision and somewhat divided in their response. Admittedly, the question was difficult because these programs were not directly comparable either in length or content, as was pointed out by numerous respondents. Furthermore, some military participants had not attended a senior service school and were, therefore, not well qualified to express an opinion. The purpose of the question, however, was to find out how far a military participant would go in

expressing his interest and enthusiasm for a broadly-oriented top level management program applicable to both non-military and military personnel as opposed to military-oriented programs more directly applicable to matters of defense and national security. The response, as tabulated in Table 4-e, was both interesting and surprising - interesting in that the Army participants established an entirely different pattern

Table 4-e

Military Participants' Preference for Harvard AMP as Opposed to Senior Service Schools
(Expressed as Percentages)

Service Group	AMP	Military School	No Answer
Army	23	66	11
Navy	58	29	13
Air Force	52	26	22
Composite	43	41	16

of response from that of both Navy and Air Force participants, and surprising in that, despite the numerous remarks from participants of all three Services to the effect that military programs were of more direct benefit to military personnel since they were more responsive to the military situation, slightly over fifty-one per cent of all participants who actually answered the question favored the Advanced Management Program over a senior military program if such a choice was necessary.

At the expense of perhaps going a little far afield, the responses to the last two questions discussed above seem to establish some feeling for the depth of conviction on the part of military participants and tend to confirm previously discussed data from which it was concluded that military participants express greatest interest in non-functional subject matter of presumably equal value to all executives aspiring to senior management positions, regardless of their specialized training, background, and experience.

Quality of Instruction

Previous studies of university-sponsored executive development programs have concluded that the quality of instruction at such programs exercises considerable influence on the impact received by participants. In fact, McKay, in his study, found that the faculty exerted a greater influence on impact than any other single program factor which he considered, including methods of instruction, personal effort of participants, and length of program.[5] Furthermore, on the basis of a review of the literature on university programs, the following hypothesis is stated for test and evaluation.

> Hypothesis: The competence of the faculty has a significant influence on the impact experienced by participants in university-

---

[1] McKay, op. cit., page 152.

sponsored executive development programs.

In testing the above hypothesis, two different approaches were used. First, each participant was asked, by question fourteen in the participants' questionnaire, to indicate whether his expression of interest in the various courses included in the Program was primarily a reflection of the way the course was taught or of the participant's basic interest in the course. Perhaps the reader has noted that the response to this question was also considered in discussion of the preceding factor on Preferred Course Content. Participants were further asked, in question twelve, what they thought of the faculty's teaching effectiveness. Both of these questions were taken from the questionnaire used by Andrews in his study of executive development programs in order to facilitate comparison of both military and non-military data. Responses, after being compared and analyzed, were expected to shed some light on participant reaction to faculty effectiveness and quality of instruction.

Army

The response of Army participants to a question concerning whether the expression of interest in subjects taught at the Advanced Management Program was a reflection of the way in which the course was taught or more of a reflection of basic interest on the part of the respondent, involved

a variety of comments representing a wide range of personal feelings. At the two extremes were emphatic statements such as, "Basic interest. In fact Administrative Practices (which was rated as being of greatest personal interest) was poorly presented," and, by contrast, "Very much in the way the subjects were presented." Although ninety per cent of the Army participants who answered the question said they were primarily influenced by their basic interest in the subject, most of them avoided the extreme statements discussed above and qualified their judgement with such statements as, "I believe basic interest carries greater weight, but teaching methods and personality are certainly influencing factors."

Ninety-one per cent of the Army respondents were favorably inclined toward the faculty's teaching effectiveness. The analysis of their comments in citing strengths and weaknesses of the faculty provided some insight as to the criterion used in formulating positive and negative attitudes. The most effective instructors were generally those who were able to lead a class discussion well by stimulating thought processes, who were knowledgeable and enthusiastic in their specialty, and who were able to communicate well with the students.

The greatest criticism, even among those respondents who were very favorably impressed with the teaching

effectiveness of the faculty, concerned the case method of instruction. Almost thirty-eight per cent of those who expressed their opinions and comments either alluded to or openly criticized the case method. These comments were characterized by statements such as, "Faculty was fine, but would appreciate a school solution or summary by the professor of the principles involved," "Outstanding faculty. Case method was used to excess. Need principles and fundamentals to introduce early phases," and, "Outstanding instruction but suggest professors guide the discussion - keep students from straying off the subject." Much of the criticism of the case method seemed to be the result of unfamiliarity of participants with this method of instruction, together with the contrast between the case method and more expository methods of instruction used in most military schools. For example, one Army participant who had previously been an instructor at a highly respected Army school, and who had reported unfavorably on the faculty's teaching effectiveness, said, "As a soldier, I appreciate a solution - but the professors sort of floated around the answers." Another respondent who was unfavorably impressed with the faculty's performance stated, with great feeling, "I was amazed at the performances! They knew what they were talking about, but their techniques!! They would not last at an Army Service school as an instructor. In short - terrible."

By and large, however, favorable remarks greatly outnumbered unfavorable ones and there was little doubt, from the reaction of most respondents, that the faculty had certainly favorably influenced Army participants.

Navy

Most Navy participants, in fact eighty-nine per cent of those respondents who expressed an opinion, thought that their expression of interest in the various subjects taught at the Advanced Management Program was primarily influenced by their basic interest in the subjects as of the time they attended the Program. Only one or two respondents, however, seemed to be certain enough to state, without qualification, that they were influenced by basic interest only. Furthermore, nobody was willing to say that they were influenced solely by the manner in which the course was taught. Consequently, most respondents indicated the dual influence of these two forces on their interest either by the relative strengths (in percentages) of both or by such qualifying statements as, "mostly basic interest." In some instances, a reply such as, "My interest was high in all areas but a moderate reaction was a result of the way areas were taught," indicated some degree of serious consideration on the part of the respondent. There were indications, in many responses, that the quality of instruction played a more important part in influencing interest in a subject than the participant had

actually realized. One such indication was a statement made by a Navy respondent who, after having reflected on his situation, claimed that both basic interest and the way in which the course was taught had influenced his indication of interest in the various areas but that, "the manner in which the subject was presented might have influenced my rating unduly." On other occassions, participants seemed less conscious of the influence of instruction, but slight indications of such influence were detected throughout the remarks concerning their expression of interest.

Navy respondents were the most favorably disposed, among participants of the three Services, in evaluating the faculty's teaching effectiveness, with ninety-four per cent of them indicating favorability. Most of the criticism underlying participants' comments about faculty strengths and weaknesses had to do more with the way one or two specific courses were taught rather than with a critical analysis of instructor effectiveness. Accounting and Finance drew the most criticism in this respect, primarily on the basis of being improperly designed for the wide spectrum of student needs and of being poorly taught (possibly because of this alleged improper course design). Participants did tend to classify good professors, however, as those who could effectively stimulate the class to think and respond, who were experienced and practical in their approach, and who could communicate well with the class.

Unlike the situation with Army and Air Force participants, there was very little criticism of the case method of instruction. On the contrary, several Navy participants commended the case system. One respondent, for instance, said, "Case studies for a heterogeneous class composition are superior to other types of teaching." One of the two Navy participants who expressed an unfavorable reaction to the faculty's teaching effectiveness cited poor preparation as the largest single fault, followed by poor administration. Poor administration was also mentioned by several other respondents but without much elaboration except for the criticism of redundancy toward the last two or three weeks of the Program.

The faculty and its teaching methods, judging from the reactions and responses of Navy participants, affected the impact experienced from attendance at the Program, perhaps to a greater extent than the participants themselves realized.

Air Force

Air Force participants, more so than participants from either of the other two Services, stated that their indication of degrees of personal interest in various subject areas offered at the Advanced Management Program was substantially influenced by the way in which the subject was taught (refer to Table 4-c for comparative purposes). The

nature of response was quite diverse, however, ranging from an emphatic,"completely basic interest," to a more tempered, "how taught was the heavy determinant in my interest." While seventy-eight per cent of the Air Force respondents who chose to comment on what predominantly influenced their expression of interest in various subject areas said they were principally influenced by the basic interest they brought with them to the Program, most of them qualified their remarks by such statements as, "primarily based on basic interest." While nobody went so far as to indicate that their interest was influenced completely by the manner in which the subject was taught, this element of influence was generally recognized, in some degree, either implicitly or explicitly in the participants' remarks.

Although most Air Force participants (eighty-one per cent) were favorably impressed with the faculty's teaching effectiveness, the response in this direction was not as strong as that experienced in the other two Services. A great deal of the criticism leveled by those who were unfavorable, however, centered around opposition to the case method of study rather than weaknesses in faculty performance. For instance, there were statements such as:

> "Faculty's teaching could be greatly improved. Should be a 50-50 split between faculty teaching by lecture and student participation. We

learned what others like us would do and how they think, but not too much as to what was approved solution or solutions."

"Those who say 'What do you think?' to a real question are wasting our time. Give me a trained professor who can summarize the difficulties and highlight problems remaining."

"Too much reliance on case method. Realize this is a sacred cow."

Although there were one or two respondents who were critical of the case method of study even though they reported favorably on teaching effectiveness, many of those who were favorably inclined toward the faculty cited the value of student participation through the use of the case method as one of the determining factors in helping them form a favorable reaction toward the Program.

Criteria which Air Force participants appeared to use in evaluating the effectiveness of the Advanced Management Program faculty indicated that good professors were those who were knowledgeable and experienced in their field, who were enthusiastic about their subject, who could stimulate thought, and could communicate with the students.

The great majority of Air Force participants, as indicated by their reaction and response to the questions discussed, were favorably impressed with the faculty and

felt that this faculty had definitely influenced their impressions and disposition toward the Program.

Composite

Military participants in the Advanced Management Program claimed that their principal interest in the subject matter of the various courses comprising the curriculum was determined primarily by the basic interest which they brought with them to the Program. Some of the more articulate respondents specifically referred to their professional objectives and their related interests in those subjects considered to be most germane to a particular job assignment or special interest in the military service while others, sometimes indirectly, indicated a lack of basic interest in subjects with which their military interests were not closely aligned. Perhaps this indicated tendency toward professional orientation helps explain, to some extent, the spread between military and non-military participants' reactions with regard to the relative influence of the way in which the course was taught (see Table 4-c). In only rare instances, however, did respondents exclude the influence of the faculty as a factor in promoting interest and enthusiasm for a particular subject or course. Although this faculty influence was recognized, in varying degrees, by most participants, there were indications that some participants

were influenced by the faculty more than they actually realized or admitted. The indecision or unwillingness to comment on this issue, as evidenced by the number of respondents who chose not to answer the question, may be a further indication of both the difficulty and lack of certainty involved in assessing the degree of influence on interest exerted by the faculty.

The reaction of military participants to the faculty's teaching effectiveness was overwhelmingly favorable, as shown in Table 4-f. Especially noteworthy is the significant percentage difference between favorable response of the military participants as compared with the non-military participants studied by Andrews. This finding is contrary to the writer's expectation that military participants would tend to be more critical of the faculty since they have generally been exposed to a number of both Service and non-Service schools during their military careers and would

Table 4-f

Favorable Reaction to AMP Faculty Teaching Effectiveness

Classification of Participant	Per Cent Favorable
Army	91
Navy	94
Air Force	81
Military Composite	89
Non-Military	60

probably have had more recent schooling experiences than their non-military contemporaries from which to draw a more critical comparative analysis. On the other hand, if this was so, perhaps the participants' high esteem for the Advanced Management Faculty was the result of a contrast with the less superior staffs at previously attended schools.

Most of the criticism aimed at faculty effectiveness by military participants was centered on the case method of instruction practiced so extensively in the Program. Such criticism was expressed both by those favorably impressed with the faculty and by those who were less favorably disposed. The majority of these critics appeared to have been exposed to the case method of teaching for the first time and failed to appreciate the departure from more conventional techniques of instruction. In some instances, direct comparisons were even made between the participants' preferred methods of instruction as practiced at certain Service schools and the methods practiced at the Advanced Management Program. It seemed that most participants who opposed the case method felt a need for more direction on the part of the instructor. They wanted to be told what should have been done - what the "right" solution would have been. Other than this dissatisfaction with the <u>method</u> of instruction, those who were unfavorably impressed with the faculty cited very few other

major criticisms. Aside from some comments about the distaste for individual instructors, the largest single classification of criticism was that of poor administration aimed primarily at balancing workloads and eliminating redundancy in the curriculum.

Although the number of military participants who were unfavorably impressed with the faculty was very small and therefore established such a small sample that conclusions drawn from this data would have little statistical significance, it was interesting to note, in the responses of those participants, the close correlation between dissatisfaction with the faculty and unfavorable reaction to the overall Program. Even though inconclusive, this observation supports Andrews' findings to the effect that there tends to be a direct relationship between a participant's finding the faculty to be effective and his own favorable reaction to the program in which he was engaged.[6]

The military participants' exceptionally favorable reaction to faculty teaching effectiveness at the Advanced Management Program, linked with the extremely favorable reaction to the Program itself, as expressed through both questionnaires and interviews, and fortified by the findings

---

[6] Andrews, 1964, op. cit., p. IV-49.

of other students regarding the significance of this relationship, tends to support and substantiate the hypothesis stated at the beginning of this section on Quality of Instruction. Furthermore, even though military participants seem to feel that their interests in various subjects taught in the Program are influenced primarily by their basic interest in the subject, they generally, either explicitly or implicitly, acknowledged some degree of influence exerted by the way in which a particular subject was taught. While it appears that this latter influence is not as strong among military as among non-military personnel, it is still a factor of considerable importance in determining the nature and degree of impact experienced by attendance at the Program.

Optimum Class Composition

Students in the field of management development generally agree that class composition plays an important part in determining the impact of management training programs on participants.[7] Studies by McKay[8] and Powell were typical in concluding that classes composed of high

---

[7] McKay, op. cit., p. 158.

[8] Reed M. Powell, The Role and Impact of the Part-Time University Program in Executive Education. (Los Angeles: University of California at Los Angeles, 1962), p. 70.

caliber executives diversified with respect to geographic location, business function, and industry, yet fairly uniform in age, experience, and level of management, are most likely to contribute to favorable impact. One of the purposes of this study was to determine whether military personnel shared the opinion of research personnel concerning the above conclusions on optimum class composition and, if so, to what extent. The design for data collection toward this end was to ask participants if they considered the diverse backgrounds and caliber of students composing their classes to be of benefit in their training program and, if so, why? (Question sixteen in the questionnaire to participants.) In order to supplement and refine this answer, question seventeen asked the participant for a yes or no response as to whether or not he thought he would have benefited more from a military-sponsored program in executive development attended exclusively by military personnel. Not only would the answer to this question help validate the answer to question sixteen, but it would also help define the participants' scope of thinking on the extent and degree of diversification. For example, by diversified background did the military participant consider the inclusion of non-military diversification as beneficial to his training or did he think that such a wide spectrum of unrelated diversity would be detrimental and that the benefits which could accrue from assembling a diversified

inter-Service military student body would be more practical and helpful to him as a military officer.

The response to both of the above questions was so uniform and strong from participants of all three Services that a single composite military analysis should be adequate in evaluating this data. In fact, an affirmative response to question sixteen, where participants claimed the diverse backgrounds and caliber of students was extremely beneficial to the Program, was unanimous. Strong feelings were expressed by participants from all three Services in their comments as to why they felt they benefited from the composition of a student body with a widely diversified background. Typical of such comments were statements such as:

> "Tremendous benefit. It helped me understand and cope with the civilian world. I never dreamed it was so parochial."
>
> "The most significant benefit of the program. Broadened perspective and understanding."
>
> "The caliber of the student is as important as the caliber of the faculty."
>
> "Very beneficial. Each of the students, in his own field, was a far greater expert than the faculty. This is natural, just like it was at the Service War Colleges."
>
> "Observations of student body and cross fertilization of ideas was most important

part of the course."

"The greatest benefit was from the cross section of ideas and approaches available."

"The diverse backgrounds are absolutely necessary in case study discussions. I learned as much from my classmates as from the faculty."

"The contribution of administrative and executive experience that was put forth in class discussion was of inestimable value."

"It was the main method of 'teaching'."

"At least fifty per cent of the value of the course, to me, came from knowledge and experiences of my fellow students."

It should be quite evident, from the enthusiasm and candor demonstrated in the expression of the above statements, that military participants valued highly the contribution of their classmates to their overall learning experience. One participant, who was rather critical of the entire Program, went so far as to say that the diversified background of such high caliber students "was the greatest merit of the program and that without this caliber of participation, the outcome would be dubious."

In light of the strong and positive response described above, perhaps the answers to question seventeen, asking the participant if he thought he would have benefited more from a

military-oriented executive development course, are less critical. It was interesting to note, however, that responses to this question were not only consistent in content with those in question sixteen but reflected the same strong feeling. Even though question seventeen was designed as forced choice (yes or no), over fourteen per cent of the military respondents expressed their answers more forcefully by adding notes, adjectives, underscores, etc., to emphasize their negative reaction to substituting a military executive development course for the Harvard Advanced Management Program. Table 4-d summarizes the response of all three Services and shows a composite military response of ninety-seven per cent against substituting a military program. Of only three military respondents who said they thought they would have benefited more from a military-sponsored course, two qualified their answers by "possibly" and "only if it were directed to subjects of military interest," while the third, although he offered no qualification to his answer, was not favorably impressed with the Program as a whole. As a matter of fact, all three respondents were less favorably disposed toward the Program than the vast majority of their contemporaries.

All of this evidence on military participants strongly supports the conclusions drawn by researchers concerning the value of a high caliber and appropriately

diversified student body in creating a favorable impact from training. There were many military participants who felt that the opportunity to associate with other top-level military and non-military management personnel and to exchange stimulating thoughts and ideas with them was one of the greatest benefits they received from the Program. Some participants recognized, and expressed, the undesirable effects which could be realized, however, if this diversity in age, experience, and organization level of class members became so wide as to be distracting. The objectives and student selection procedures of the training institution, however, have been formulated to avoid such a situation, wherever possible, and to arrange the best "mix" of class members. The importance of training objectives to a training institution, as discussed early in Chapter Three of this thesis, is hereby illustrated through this example. Furthermore, military participants consistently opposed substituting a military-oriented executive development course for the Advanced Management Program because of the resulting loss of this distinct advantage of diversity which they claim has been so influential in creating a favorable Program impact.

Personal Interest in Selection

There is a widely accepted theory that those who undertake a course of study on their own initiative generally

perform better and derive greater benefit from such an endeavor than do those who are requested or urged to attend. Andrews reported this to be true in his study of executive development programs, in that a participant who initiated the idea of attending a program was more receptive, less apprehensive, and better prepared than one who was chosen by his company to attend.[9] He also noted that the self-starter generally benefited more from his experience,[10] and that those who entered a program with reservations in their minds were generally less favorably inclined toward their program than those who had no reservations.[11] McKay confirmed Andrews' findings and suggested that a participant's personal attitude toward attending a university executive development program exerted considerable influence on the impact he received from that program.[12]

This study on military participants in the Harvard Advanced Management Program was designed, in part, to determine the extent of personal initiative exerted by military officers of the three Services toward attending the Program, the

---

9 Andrews, 1964, op. cit., p. III-13.

10 Ibid., p. III-15.

11 Ibid., p. IV-45.

12 McKay, op. cit., p. 151.

reaction of those participants who were selected to attend without exercising any of their own initiative, the number and type of reservations which existed in the minds of those who were selected to attend, and the effect any or all of these factors had on favorability and impact experienced by participants. Each Service group will first be reviewed and analyzed separately. A military composite will then be developed and weighed against comparable data compiled by Professor Andrews in his study of non-military participants at the Harvard Program. In order to insure comparability of data between military and non-military participants, questions from Andrews' questionnaire were adapted and used as questions four and five on the questionnaire sent to military participants. Question four merely asked who initiated the idea for attendance and, if it was the sponsoring activity, what the participants' first reaction was to the news of his selection. Question five asked if the participant had any reservations about attending the Program and, if so, what they were. The answers to these questions were then compared with other data in the participants' questionnaire in order to relate them with favorability and impact of the Program. Indications of favorability and impact were found in the response to questions on: objectives (Question 7), results (Question 8), length of program (Question 10), faculty teaching effectiveness (Question 12), interest in courses (Question 13),

substitution of a military program (Question 17), reaction to having other military officers attend the Program (Question 18), increased responsibility (Question 24), and effective utilization of experience (Question 26), together with the overall tone of response and any miscellaneous comments volunteered by the respondent.

Army

Only fourteen per cent of the Army participants initiated the idea of their attending the Program. This was, by far, the lowest percentage of any of the Services. Most participants were pleased, however, when they were first informed that the Army had initiated action to have them attend the Program. Although eighty per cent of these participants indicated a favorable reaction to the notification of their selection, and nobody reacted unfavorably, seventeen per cent of the participants said they had mixed reactions at that time. All but one of those participants who reported mixed reactions said he had some reservations about going to the Program.

In addition to reservations on the part of those who registered mixed reactions to their selection, there were a number of participants who favorably accepted the news of their selection but who still claimed to have reservations about attending the Program. In fact, twenty-nine per cent of all the Army participants said they had some type of

reservation which worried them. The nature of these reservations, as described by the participants, were classified and tabulated below:

Classification	Frequence of Mention
Financial	31%
Away from Job	31%
Away from Family	15%
Doubt Personal Ability	15%
Career Implications	8%

Most of these classifications are self explanatory, but perhaps a word of explanation may help clarify and explain the significance of certain issues. Concern about the financial aspects of attending the Program stems from the fact that military participants received only a rather small fixed allowance to cover the additional expenses incurred as a result of their being separated from their families for the thirteen weeks of residence at the School. Non-military participants, on the other hand, were generally on rather liberal expense accounts. Consequently, in order to "keep up" with the social standards established by their classmates, military personnel found it necessary to spend from $500 to $1,000 more than their expense allowances during their attendance at the Program. The amount varied considerably by the social characteristics of the "can group" or immediate associates of the individual participant. This additional money many times had to come from the personal savings of the

individual participants and some officers seriously considered either their ability or inclination to resort to this means of subsidy for the privilege of participating.

Career implications refers to concern, by participants, about how their attendance at the Program would affect their military future. More specifically, in this case, was the concern about loss of career flexibility - the fact that attendance at the Program committed an Army participant to four years of additional military service. In view of this requirement, it seemed surprising that personal reservations regarding this issue were not more prevalent.

The task of associating the above data with participants' expressed or implied attitudes toward the Course and its impact on them was rather difficult. Elements of favorability pervaded most of the questionnaires returned by participants so that no sharp lines of demarcation seemed to exist between groups of sponsor-initiated participants with favorable reactions versus those with less favorable reactions, sponsor-initiated participants with reservations versus those without reservations, and self-initiated participants. There was a tendency, however, for self-initiated participants to be a little more enthusiastic and slightly more favorable in their response, and likewise, there was a tendency for sponsor-initiated participants who had reservations about attending the Program and who had less than favorable reactions

to attendance when initially notified of their selection, to be more critical, less enthusiastic, and sometimes even sarcastic about their experience. Even though statistically inconclusive, one got the impression that those participants who initiated the idea of their attending the Program experienced a somewhat greater impact than those who were less enthusiastic about the opportunity.

Navy

Thirty-nine per cent of the Navy participants initiated the idea and requested the opportunity to attend the Advanced Management Program. Of those who did not initiate the idea themselves, eighty-three per cent reacted favorably when first informed by their sponsoring activity that they had been selected to attend. Nobody reported an unfavorable reaction to the news of their selection. Furthermore, all of those Navy participants who reacted other than favorably to the notification of their selection said that they had some reservations about attending the Program, which may have accounted for their less than favorable reaction. Despite this, however, only nineteen per cent of all the Navy participants had any reservations about attending. The nature of these reservations was predominantly professional and may be classified in the following categories:

Classification	Frequence of Mention
Away from Job	50%
Career Implications	17%
Financial	16%
Away from Family	16%

Career implications, as it concerned Navy participants, involved anxiety over how attendance at the Program for thirteen weeks would affect the participant's availability for specifically desired duty assignments if such assignments should have become available during the time the participant was enrolled in school. In other words, would going to school, even for such a relatively brief period, jeopardize an individual's chances for certain desirable or key career pattern assignments? Although other participants felt, on the contrary, that attendance at the Program was, in itself, a decided asset in career development, no attempt was made, nor was there any intent to evaluate the rationale or validity of participants' reservations. Hardships of a financial nature caused by the necessity for spending personal funds to meet substantial additional expenses while attending school were discussed more fully in the evaluation of reservations held by Army participants. The remaining classifications of reservations are self explanatory.

After assembling all participants' questionnaires into their four main classifications (those sponsor-initiated participants with favorable reactions and reservations; sponsor-initiated participants with less than favorable reactions and reservations; sponsor-initiated participants with favorable reactions but without reservations; and self-initiated participants) an evaluation was made to try to relate respective responses with general attitudes and indicated impact as conveyed by individual participants. General or uniform patterns of response were not evident, to any great extent, within these four classifications of participants. Even some of those individuals who did not initiate the idea of their attending, and who had reservations about going to the Program, seemed exceptionally favorable in their attitude toward the Program and in their indication of its impact on them. There did seem to be a tendency, however, for more consistent favorability in the response of participants who initiated the idea of their going to the Program and who expressed no reservations concerning their attendance.

Air Force

Over half (fifty-one per cent) of the Air Force participants took the initiative in suggesting to their sponsors that they attend the Advanced Management Program.

The number of so-called self-starters was considerably higher among Air Force participants than in either of the other two Services. Furthermore, eighty-seven per cent of those who did not initiate the idea themselves reacted favorably when first advised of their selection to attend the Program. Of only two participants who did not react favorably, one said he reacted unfavorably when informed of his selection and the other claimed to have had mixed emotions concerning his attendance. Both participants had reservations about participating in the Program, however, and in both instances, the reservations concerned doubt about the value of advanced management training to the respective individuals. The participants involved were somewhat exceptional in that one was more senior than most of his contemporaries at the time he attended the Program and felt that, since he was already experienced in high level management, the Course was not particularly applicable to him. The other possessed more formal education than many of his contemporaries and questioned the value of the Advanced Management Program in an Air Force career. As might have been expected, neither of these participants experienced either a very favorable reaction or a favorable impact from the Program.

Even some of those who reacted favorably to the notification of their selection for the Program expressed some reservations about attending. In fact, two participants

who themselves initiated the idea of their attending the Program said they had personal reservations but still wanted to avail themselves of the opportunity to attend. Both men, incidently, experienced a very favorable impact from their experience. In all, twenty-six per cent of the Air Force participants had reservations of one type or another, most of them being of a personal nature. These reservations were classified by category and tabulated as follows:

Classification	Frequence of Mention
Financial	67%
Career Implications	22%
Doubt Personal Ability	11%

Apparently Air Force participants were well aware of the personal financial burden created by the substantial unreimbursed expenses incurred while attending school and keeping company with non-military participants on expense accounts. This issue is discussed in more detail in the evaluation of reservations disturbing Army participants.

Career implications for Air Force participants, however, took on a different aspect from that considered by either Army or Navy personnel, in that a small number of Air Force respondents expressed doubts about the value of advanced management training to their military careers. These individuals, it should be pointed out, were definitely in the minority.

Although the classification of "Doubt Personal Ability" is generally self explanatory, it is interesting to note that the participant who had a reservation about his ability to participate did not, interestingly enough, lack faith in his intellectual capacity or educational background (he possessed a masters degree), as might generally and properly be assumed from the title of this classification, but was uncertain as to how a military man would be accepted and participate in the group.

In addition to the two small groups of respondents classified above (sponsor-initiated participants expressing less than favorable reactions to news of their selection and self-initiated participants with reservations), which have already been discussed, the remaining participants' questionnaires were grouped into three classifications - sponsor-initiated participants with favorable reactions but with reservations, sponsor-initiated participants with favorable reactions but without reservations, and self-initiated participants without reservations. A review of each of these classifications of response disclosed no consistent pattern of reaction or impact. Reactions were predominantly favorable in all groups except for numerous dissatisfactions with the utilization of participants' experiences upon completion of the Program. Only in the extreme situations where initial reaction to selection was not very favorable did a consistently unfavorable impact result.

Composite

Some indication of the personal interest and enthusiasm displayed by military personnel for attending the

Harvard Advanced Management Program was evidenced by the fact that thirty-four per cent of the military participants in the Program initiated the idea themselves and requested their sponsors to send them. As evident from Table 4-g, far more military personnel than non-military took the initiative in suggesting to their sponsors that they attend the

Table 4-g

Initiator of Idea for Attending the Advanced Management Program
(Expressed as percentages of response)

	Participant	Sponsor
Army	14	86
Navy	39	61
Air Force	51	49
Military Composite	34	66
Non-Military	15	85

Program. Two extenuating circumstances, however, may help account for part of this disparity. First, the military Services traditionally stress continued schooling for their personnel and follow the general practice of both encouraging and sponsoring personnel to attend a variety of schools. Furthermore, the three Services have participated in the Harvard Advanced Management Program for a number of years and have established fairly firm quotas of officer input for each class session. This rather consistent sponsorship for participation in the Program is well known to eligible and potentially eligible officers within the Services, an advantage which many times does not exist in non-military situations.

Of those who did not, themselves, initiate the idea of attending the Program, eighty-three per cent said they reacted favorably to the news when their sponsor told them they had been selected, while only two per cent reported an unfavorable reaction. Table 4-h shows a tabulation of the initial reactions of both military and non-military participants. While

Table 4-h

Initial Reaction to Notification of Selection to Attend the Harvard AMP
(Expressed as percentages of response)

Classification	Army	Navy	Air Force	Military Composite	Non-Military*
Favorable	80	83	87	83	91
Indifferent	3	6	0	3	1
Mixed	17	11	7	12	4
Unfavorable	0	0	6	2	2

*Two per cent of respondents recorded miscellaneous other reactions.

the number of unfavorable reactions was about the same for both the military and non-military groups, non-military participants were somewhat more favorable in their reactions upon being informed of their selection.

As might have been expected, practically all of those military participants who reacted other than favorably had reservations about attending the Program. Since military participants who had reservations outnumbered their non-military classmates, this may help account for at least a part of the

disparity between those military and non-military participants who had either indifferent or mixed emotions. Even some of those military respondents who reacted favorably to the notification of their selection, however, claimed to have some reservations about attending. In all, some twenty-five per cent of the military participants reported reservations of one type or another as compared with only twenty per cent of the non-military participants. Although this difference is not too great, in order to understand a little more of the significance of the observation, we should look at the nature of the reservations described by the various participants.

By far the greatest reservation in the minds of military personnel was the personal financial hardship associated with attendance at the Program. Thirty-nine per cent of all military reservations fell in this category. The existence of this hardship was widely recognized in military circles. Although most military officers were willing to bear this personal expense in return for the privilege of attending the Harvard Program, there were many who had to seriously consider whether or not they were able to do so without unreasonable sacrifice on the part of themselves and their families. The second most frequently mentioned reservation of military participants was concern about the time that they would be away from their jobs. This category of reservation represented twenty-five per cent of all responses.

Taken together, the combination of financial hardship and time away from work accounted for sixty-four per cent of the reservations held by military personnel and can be compared roughly with the factors of time, money, energy, etc., reported as a category of reservations held by non-military personnel but accounting for only twenty-eight per cent of all non-military responses.

The reservation mentioned most frequently by non-military participants was the necessity for leaving home and being away from their families for a considerable period of time. This single category accounted for thirty-seven per cent of all non-military responses as compared with a little less than eleven per cent of military responses. Finally, the only remaining significant category of reservations - doubting personal ability - showed rather conclusively that military personnel were a great deal more confident in their ability to compete favorably in the Program than were non-military personnel. This reservation was mentioned in twenty-one per cent of non-military responses as compared with only eleven per cent of military responses.

The type and nature of reservations for both military and non-military participants were chiefly personal and reflected, to a great extent, work habits and experience. Consequently, the weaker financial position of most military participants, aggravated by the failure of their sponsors to

reimburse or cover full expenses attendant with the Program, made financial hardship of chief concern to them, whereas they had become more or less conditioned to being separated from their families and therefore were less concerned than non-military personnel about this type of personal hardship.

A thorough analysis was made of the responses in each participant's entire questionnaire, with concentration on the answers to certain key questions, in an attempt to detect implicit as well as explicit indications of the degree of favorability and impact experienced by various categories of military participants in the Program. The predominantly favorable reaction of participants to the Program pervaded most questionnaires to the point where it was extremely difficult to identify and establish a common pattern of characteristics or responses with any one particular classification of participants in order to determine, for instance, how the matter of mental reservations influenced the impact of participants who did not initiate the idea of their attending the Program. About all that could be concluded was that there were two broad observations concerning extreme conditions. First, that participants who reacted unfavorably when selected to attend the Program and who had serious reservations regarding its value to them, did not experience a favorable impact, and secondly, that there seemed to be a tendency for those who took the initiative in suggesting to their sponsor that

they attend the Program, and who had no reservations concerning their attendance, to be consistently more receptive, enthusiastic, and favorably inclined and therefore to have received a greater impact from their Program experience.

All of this data, of course, must be tempered with the realization that participants generally view and report their training experiences in a more favorable light with the passage of time. It was encouraging, however, to note that some of the participants were enthusiastic and responsive enough to cite specific examples of ways in which they benefited or were able to apply the experiences and impact they felt they received from attendance at the Program.

Optimum Age and Rank

This factor of Optimum Age and Rank, while emphasizing the military characteristics attendant to participation in the Advanced Management Program, ties in closely with the non-military aspect of age and level of management of participants. It was selected for consideration in this study of influence on impact because of concern for the subject as evidenced by military participants during the course of personal interviews conducted prior to initiation of the study.

Andrews,[13] McKay,[14] Gormbley,[15] and others in the field have agreed that age of participants appears to have only a moderate influence on the impact they experience from having attended a university management development program. They found, in general, that good impact was most likely to occur in participants between the ages of 38 to 50 and that men over 55 were less favorably inclined toward their programs than those participants of any other age. Powell, on the other hand, in his study of participants in an executive development program at UCLA, found that age was not a distinguishing characteristic between those experiencing high, moderate, or negative impacts.[16] Despite this apparent disparity, one may conclude that age is certainly not a vital factor in determining impact. Bearing this in mind, an attempt was made to determine, from military participants at the Harvard Advanced Management Program, how they felt about the optimum age and rank of military participants in the Program.

The military services appear to have considered the Advanced Management Program as a top level management

---

13 Andrews, 1964, op. cit., p. IV-43.

14 McKay, op. cit., p. 149.

15 William P. Gormbley, The Effectiveness of Management Development Programs: The Impact of Job Climate (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1963),

16 Powell, op. cit., p. 52.

they attend the Program, and who had no reservations concerning their attendance, to be consistently more receptive, enthusiastic, and favorably inclined and therefore to have received a greater impact from their Program experience.

All of this data, of course, must be tempered with the realization that participants generally view and report their training experiences in a more favorable light with the passage of time. It was encouraging, however, to note that some of the participants were enthusiastic and responsive enough to cite specific examples of ways in which they benefited or were able to apply the experiences and impact they felt they received from attendance at the Program.

Optimum Age and Rank

This factor of Optimum Age and Rank, while emphasizing the military characteristics attendant to participation in the Advanced Management Program, ties in closely with the non-military aspect of age and level of management of participants. It was selected for consideration in this study of influence on impact because of concern for the subject as evidenced by military participants during the course of personal interviews conducted prior to initiation of the study.

Andrews,[13] McKay,[14] Gormbley,[15] and others in the field have agreed that age of participants appears to have only a moderate influence on the impact they experience from having attended a university management development program. They found, in general, that good impact was most likely to occur in participants between the ages of 38 to 50 and that men over 55 were less favorably inclined toward their programs than those participants of any other age. Powell, on the other hand, in his study of participants in an executive development program at UCLA, found that age was not a distinguishing characteristic between those experiencing high, moderate, or negative impacts.[16] Despite this apparent disparity, one may conclude that age is certainly not a vital factor in determining impact. Bearing this in mind, an attempt was made to determine, from military participants at the Harvard Advanced Management Program, how they felt about the optimum age and rank of military participants in the Program.

The military services appear to have considered the Advanced Management Program as a top level management

---

13 Andrews, 1964, op. cit., p. IV-43.

14 McKay, op. cit., p. 149.

15 William P. Gormbley, The Effectiveness of Management Development Programs: The Impact of Job Climate (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1963),

16 Powell, op. cit., p. 52.

training course and have limited their selection of participants in this Program to senior officers of the grade of Colonel and General Officers (Army and Air Force) and to Captain and Flag Officers (Navy). By establishing a minimum rank level, age of participants is also fairly effectively controlled since age is roughly related to rank. Another factor associated with both age and rank, however, is the number of years of military service attained by the participant. In view of the provision for possible retirement of military personnel upon completion of twenty years of active duty, the length of military service takes on increased importance in the consideration of this issue. Most military officers in a position to be selected for the Advanced Management Program were eligible for retirement even prior to attending the Program. In apparent recognition of this possibility of early retirement, the Army imposed a four year period of obligated service for all of its participants who attended the Program. The Air Force, in like manner, imposed thirty-nine weeks of obligated service but has recently initiated action to increase this period of obligation. The Navy, on the other hand, has imposed no obligated service on the theory that if an officer is forced to remain on active duty against his will,

his effectiveness will probably be impaired and he may do more harm than good for the organization as a whole. No attempt will be made to discuss the merits of these philosophies. The point is that there was obvious concern for a "return on investment" on the part of the sponsors. This matter also concerned the participants themselves to the point where some of them raised the question as to whether or not slightly less senior officers should not be sent to the Program earlier in their military careers so that they would have a longer period of time in which to utilize the benefits of their training. In order to determine the reaction of military participants to this issue, question nineteen on the participants' questionnaire asked, "What is your reaction toward having somewhat younger and slightly less senior officers attend the Harvard Advanced Management Program earlier in their military career (e.g., perhaps senior Lieutenant Colonels or Commanders age 38 to 40)?" The reactions to this question are analyzed and discussed below.

Army

Most (sixty-nine per cent) Army participants were opposed to the idea of sending younger and less senior officers to the Advanced Management Program. The principal reason advanced was the feeling that military participants should be of approximately the same age and experience level as their non-military contemporaries. A few respondents

cited a 44 to 46 year age range as most appropriate. They felt that the military image would be tarnished with a resulting loss of prestige if younger, less mature, and less experienced officers were to attend. One respondent said, "Their (future Army participants') contemporaries at the AMP would be older and they would not have the same rapport and influence as the older officers. We teach these civilians much while we are here."

There were some respondents who, although they basically opposed sending younger officers to the Program as a matter of policy, thought that certain exceptions might be in order. For instance, they suggested that if a younger Lieutenant Colonel possessed an unusually attractive background, was of outstanding caliber, and was potential General Officer material, an exception could be made to the regulation that participants must be of the rank of Colonel or higher. They made it clear, however, that their suggestion applied only on an exception basis.

Navy

Navy participants reacted in much the same manner as Army participants toward the suggestion of sending younger and less senior officers to the Harvard Program. Sixty-eight per cent opposed the idea, mainly because they thought that by sending more junior officers the military participants would be younger and less experienced than their non-military

associates and therefore be at a disadvantage in both contributing and competing with their contemporaries. Also of concern was the military image and the reasoning on the part of several participants, that the more mature and experienced the military man, and the more clearly he saw and appreciated the "big picture," the more effective would be the image he created. One suggestion was even made to the effect that a management course stressing specific administrative skills would be more appropriate for the 38 to 40 year age group.

A few of the Navy participants who couldn't quite agree with the idea of senior Lieutenant Colonels and Commanders being selected to attend the Program, did propose that junior Colonels and Captains be selected - or perhaps even Lieutenant Colonels and Commanders who had already been recommended for promotion, even though they may not as yet have been promoted as of the time they attended the Program. Perhaps this is splitting hairs but it is indicative of the overall reluctancy on the part of past participants to lower the threshold of eligibility for future Navy participants in the Program.

Air Force

Unlike the pattern established by both Army and Navy participants, the majority (fifty-seven per cent) of Air Force participants favored selecting younger and less senior officers to attend the Advanced Management Program.

Those who expressed this opinion felt that the Government would gain more by selecting younger participants who would be able to apply their knowledge and experiences earlier in their military careers and for a longer period of time than would be possible if such training was delayed. The fact that Air Force participants were somewhat younger individually, and on the average, than Army and Navy participants may have influenced their reaction. One respondent, for instance, said, "At age 39, I was one of the younger students. I found that many officers attended the Course in the latter stages of their careers only to make civilian contacts for retirement." It was interesting to note that all five of the retired Air Force respondents were in favor of sending younger, less senior officers to the Program.

Those who opposed lowering the rank requirment for attendance at the Program gave the same reasons generally cited by participants of the Army and Navy who similarly opposed such action. They were concerned about the lack of maturity and lack of experience less senior officers would have had in the higher echelons of management. One respondent, who appeared to have strong feelings in this respect, said he thought the Air Force should never send officers below the rank of Colonel and that preferably, Generals should attend.

Composite

The reaction of military participants, as shown in Table 4-i, toward sending younger and less senior

officers to the Harvard Advanced Management Program seems to reflect, rather consistently, the age structure within the

Table 4-i

Military Participants who Favor Sending Younger, Less Senior Officers to AMP

Service Group	Per Cent Favorable
Army	31
Navy	32
Air Force	57
Composite	40

respective Service affiliation of each participant. For example, the Army and Navy, whose participants were considerably older than those of the Air Force (see Table 4-j) were predominantly against reducing the rank limitation and

Table 4-j

Age and Years of Service of Advanced Management Program Participants

Affiliation of Participant	Average Age	Average Years of Service
Army	46.0	23.2
Navy	46.8	24.4
Air Force	44.7	21.6
Military Composite	45.8	23.1
Non-Military	43.1	15.8

consequent age of future participants in the Program, while the Air Force, with the youngest age average, was much more in favor of such action. The argument most frequently used by those who disapproved of sending younger, more junior officers was that these men would be younger than their non-military contemporaries, and therefore would be less mature and less experienced in the higher levels of management. There was a feeling that the Military must maintain its current quality level of input in order to match the caliber of non-military participants and compete on equal terms. Table 4-j shows, however, that the average age of military participants exceeds, by over two and one-half years, the average age of non-military participants and that the average years of service considerably exceeds the years of service that non-military executives have spent with the companies which have sponsored them.

While the relative ages of military and non-military participants seemed to bother many respondents, there was also the recognition that if a military officer who had attained an acceptable experience level within a minimum rank and age structure, could be sent to the Advanced Management Program earlier in his military career, he would have a longer period of productive time within the Service in which to apply his experiences. Consequently, there were several suggestions to the effect that junior Colonels and Captains should be

selected for attendance at the Program. This would tend to satisfy both of the objectives stated above- by providing a relatively mature, experienced senior officer who would have sufficient expected Service time remaining in his military career to maximize the contribution resulting from his educational experience.

Inasmuch as age, per se, does not seem to exert any significant influence on training impact but is rather a somewhat crude indicator of military experience and organizational level of the individual, perhaps the above suggestion on selection of participants on the basis of current minimum rank levels but with concentration on the junior levels within that rank, merits some consideration on the part of sponsors.

Formal Education

The general educational level of businessmen has risen appreciably since the Second World War and particularly during the past decade. This has been especially true of younger executives to the point where large numbers of present day business executives have had education at the graduate level. This same trend toward higher education has also prevailed in the military services - perhaps to even a greater extent than that experienced in industry. The Armed Services have consistently sponsored or encouraged their personnel to pursue educational opportunities. Consequently, military

personnel have become oriented to academic endeavors ranging from technical military schools to liberal arts college programs and have generally been exposed to a number and wide range of such courses throughout their military careers. One of the purposes of this study was to determine what, if any, effect this factor of formal education had on the nature and degree of impact experienced by military participants in the Harvard Advanced Management Program.

McKay found that formal education had a relatively minor influence on impact, but that non-college graduates tended to experience a somewhat greater impact than did college graduates.[17] Andrews went even further in observing that favorability of participants declined regularly with increasing formal educational level - the higher the college degree held, the lower the favorability.[18] An attempt was made to test these two observations, which may be adopted as hypotheses, with the data gathered through this study on military personnel.

Military participants in the Advanced Management Program were suspected of having more formal education than their non-military contemporaries and of having attended some

---

17 McKay, op. cit., p. 150.

18 Andrews, 1964, op. cit., p. IV-44.

type of formal training program both more frequently and more recently than their non-military associates. If this was true, military participants might have been expected to receive less of an impact than non-military participants. Perhaps military participants might also have been more critical of the Program since they probably had had more recent training experiences with which to make comparisons. Because of the relative uniformity and nature of data received, analysis will be made only of the military composite rather than of each individual Service group and this military data will be compared with that of non-military participants in the Harvard Program.

The data in Table 4-k seems to confirm the belief

Table 4-k

Formal Educational Levels
Of Advanced Management Program Participants
(Expressed as percentages)

	Army	Navy	Air Force	Military Composite	Non-Military
Less Than Four Years of College	3	0	13	5	26
Bachelors Degree	97	100	84	94	58
Masters Degree	43	45	48	46	13
Doctors Degree	0	0	3	1	5

that military participants possessed more formal education

than their non-military associates before attending the Advanced Management Program. Furthermore, the level of education seemed to be fairly consistent between the three Services. Air Force participants provided the greatest diversity of educational levels, ranging from the greatest number of non-degree holders to the highest number of higher degree holders. The absolute numbers within the extremes of this military data were actually too small, however, to provide the basis for conclusive evidence in either proving or disproving hypotheses and theories. For instance, in absolute numbers, only five military participants had less than four years of college and only one participant had earned a doctoral degree as of the time he attended the Program. Nevertheless, this did not preclude examination of the data in order to observe trends which might support hypotheses.

A review of the responses of those five participants who had not completed four years of college disclosed that all of them had completed at least two years of college work. Only one said that he had any reservations about attending the Program and, as might be expected, that reservation concerned the lack of a college degree. All of these participants, however, were highly favorable in their reaction to the Program and indicated, by their overall response, a most favorable impact.

In contrast to those participants who, although they did not possess college degrees, were highly favorable toward the Program, is the single military respondent holding a doctors degree who was not very favorably inclined toward the Program and did not receive a favorable impact from his experience.

While the contrast between these two extremes was quite pronounced, there was little or no perceptible difference found in the apparent impact experienced by military participants holding masters degrees as compared with those having only bachelors degrees. For one thing, the overall favorable reaction of participants to the Program somewhat complicated the effort of trying to distinguish between those more favorable and less favorable impacts received by individuals falling within either one of these two groups. Within the limited data of the extreme educational levels described above, however, there was a perceptible tendency for supporting the hypotheses that non-college graduates experience a greater impact than do college graduates and that the degree of program impact tends to diminish as the amount of formal education possessed by the participant increases.

Perhaps the lack of significant trends within the bachelors and masters degree categories, which may have been somewhat obscured by the predominantly favorable nature of data collected from military participants, can be explained,

in part, by another of Andrews' observations. He found that men who were sponsored by both government agencies and the military establishment were more inclined to be highly favorable toward their executive development program than those men sponsored by private enterprise.[19] The data gathered for this study certainly tends to support Andrews' observation, although no direct measures of comparability with other than military subjects are available. This, then, is certainly not compatible with the author's initial theories that, by virtue of more abundant and more recent formal educational experiences, military participants would receive less of an impact and be more critical of their training program than would be their non-military contemporaries.

The significance of this data relative to the influence of formal education on impact of executive development training may be summarized for military sponsoring activities by a statement to the effect that the amount of formal education possessed by participants in the Advanced Management Program exerts a rather insignificant effect on the impact received by those participants. There is a tendency, however, for non-college graduates to receive a slightly greater impact than college graduates. This difference in

---

19 Loc. cit., p. IV-43.

degree of impact is not especially significant and should certainly not be construed to imply that sponsoring activities would do better by selecting non-college graduates rather than college graduates as participants in the Program. By the same token, however, a truly outstanding officer should not be penalized by not being considered for the Program merely because he is lacking in formal education.

Personal Effort

The old adage that the more effort one puts into something the more benefit he is likely to receive from it has been fairly well substantiated by studies made of executive development training programs.[20] Both Andrews and McKay[21] have found that men tend to value those courses most highly which demand a great deal of hard work on their part and that the more personal effort devoted to a university program, the greater the impact generally experienced by the participant. There is no reason to believe that these principles do not apply to military as well as to non-military participants. It is the purpose of this discussion to determine to what extent personal effort affected the impact experienced by military personnel as a result of their attendance at the Advanced Management Program, to examine the nature of the motivation behind this personal effort, and to draw rough comparisons

---

20 Loc cit., p. VI-18.

21 McKay, op. cit., p. 155.

between the personal efforts of military and non-military participants.

The design for collection of data necessary for this analysis involved a series of questions to military participants. Question twenty in the participants' questionnaire asked each individual to rate his own personal application of effort during the Program as either heavy, moderate, or light. He was then asked, through question twenty-two, to compare his own personal effort and that of the other military members of his class with the personal effort exerted by his non-military classmates and to rate the military effort as either heavier, about the same, or lighter than that of non-military participants. Finally, question twenty-one asked the participant what factors most influenced his personal application of effort during his attendance at the Program. The freely expressed answers to this open-ended question conveniently fell into three major categories of influence on application of effort which will be considered, together with the other data mentioned above, by Service groups and then compared, as a military composite, with any available non-military data of like nature.

Army

While only slightly over half (fifty-six per cent) of the Army participants felt that they had strenuously

applied themselves during their attendance at the Advanced Management Program, nobody thought that they had taken the matter lightly and had failed to properly apply themselves. Two of those who rated their personal effort as only moderate, explained the basis for their rating. They claimed to have found informal discussions with their classmates so beneficial to the rounding out of their total experience that they spent a little less time on their reading assignments in order to allow more time for these discussions.

Although fifty-nine per cent of the Army respondents thought that military participants devoted about the same amount of effort to the Program as did their non-military classmates, a considerable number of them (thirty-eight per cent) felt that the military group applied themselves more diligently. Only one Army participant thought that the military effort was lighter than that of the non-military. As might be expected, he was not only critical of the Program but evidenced a rather poor impact as a result of his experience. Investigation disclosed that, while this individual rated his own effort as moderate, he stated, in defense, that he thought the lack of a grading system might be one of the reasons as to why his own personal effort was not greater. Incidently, this was the only mention, throughout the study, of using grades as an incentive and was one of the very few responses which

offered defensive reasons for reduced effort on the part of military participants.

Personal interest in the subject matter was mentioned by Army participants with the same frequency as pride in doing a good job, especially in the face of competition, as factors influencing their application of effort while attending the Program. Although these two categories accounted for seventy per cent of the response, there were a significant number of participants, eighteen per cent to be exact, who stated that they were motivated by a desire to prove the merits of Army personnel. One respondent expressed strong feelings in this respect by his statement, "Demonstrate to civilians that the Services are not manned by lazy bums."

Navy

Almost two-thirds of the Navy participants rated their personal effort devoted to the Program as heavy. One respondent even emphasized his strong feelings on this point by adding "very heavy" as another category to the three alternatives provided in reply to the forced choice question. None of the participants considered their level of effort to be light, but two individuals who thought that they had exerted only moderate effort gave an explanation as to why they felt compelled to rate themselves that way. One officer said he attempted to help administer his military assignment, physically located comparatively close to the Harvard Business School,

while attending the Program and therefore could not devote his entire energy to schooling. The other officer felt that he had worked hard and really applied himself but that the course was not nearly as demanding as some of the previous jobs to which he had been assigned and, by comparison, did not draw quite as heavily on his time and energy.

Even though the majority of Navy participants had a healthy respect for the amount of effort devoted to the Program by their non-military classmates, forty per cent of the Navy men thought that they and their military contemporaries worked harder than the non-military members of their class. None of the military members, however, felt they applied themselves less conscientiously than their non-military associates.

The factor most frequently mentioned by Navy participants as influencing their personal application of effort was that of personal interest in the subject matter and enthusiasm for the Program. The next most popular response was an indication of the individuals' pride in initiative and ability to do well and excell under competitive conditions. Also of significance, although accounting for only thirteen per cent of the response, was the desire to show the capability of Naval officers to those who were perhaps skeptical or adversely prejudiced against military personnel.

Air Force

Air Force participants, more so than participants of either of the other two Services, felt that they had devoted

a great deal of personal effort to their program of study, since seventy-one per cent of them rated their effort as heavy. One rather outspoken respondent added the following, perhaps apologetic, note to explain why he rated his own effort as only moderate, "I applied myself, but the Program was no strain." There were others, too, who felt that a moderate rating of effort reflected their value judgement in devoting some time, which might otherwise have been spent on study, to informal discussions with their classmates. In only one instance in the entire military population was there any mention of excessive social activity as inhibiting application of personal effort. None of the Air Force participants, however, considered their efforts to be lightly applied toward the activities of the Program.

Only slightly over one-quarter of the Air Force respondents considered their own and their military associates' application of effort to be heavier than that of their non-military classmates, despite the fact that they had considered their own personal effort to be so heavy. It was interesting to note that those participants who rated their own personal effort as moderate but rated general military effort as heavier than that of non-military participants, tended to be slightly less favorable in their reactions to the Program than most of their contemporaries. None of the military participants rated their effort as lighter than that of their non-military associates.

Personal interest and enthusiasm for the opportunity to participate was by far the most frequently mentioned factor for influencing the degree of personal effort exerted by Air Force participants. This followed the same pattern established by Army and Navy participants whereby personal pride and the challenge of competition represented the second most popular factor followed by a much smaller, yet significant and strong, response indicating a desire to make a good showing for the aptitude and ability of Air Force officers in general.

Composite

Military respondents quite consistently felt that they had applied more than average personal effort to their participation in the Advanced Management Program, as illustrated in Table 4-1. Although not extremely pronounced,

Table 4-1

Degree of Personal Application of Effort by Military Participants in AMP
(Expressed as percentages of response)

Degree	Army	Navy	Air Force	Composite
Heavy	55	63	71	63
Moderate	44	37	29	37
Light	0	0	0	0

there was a trend toward slightly greater favorability and impact on the part of those participants who rated their personal application of effort as heavy. In fact, a slight sense of guilt or uneasiness appeared to bother a few of those participants who rated their personal effort as moderate, rather than heavy, because they felt compelled to explain why they could not, in all fairness, rate themselves higher. This seemed to support the suspicion that participants tend to associate merit with application of effort and, perhaps even unconsciously, favor the self-image of a diligent student striving to maximize the benefits accruing from the coveted opportunity to attend the Harvard Advanced Management Program.

This same tendency, toward what has sometimes been termed the "halo effect" could also have been expected to prevail in the participants' ratings of their own and other military associates' efforts in comparison with the efforts of their non-military classmates. Table 4-m shows, however, that if there was such a tendency, it did not appear to be very strong in this instance. Although most military participants thought they worked very hard while attending the Program, almost two-thirds of them felt that everybody else worked just as hard. Yet thirty-five per cent of the military respondents saw themselves as exerting greater effort than their non-military counterparts. The logical explanation for

this alleged greater personal effort would seem to be a real

Table 4-m

Comparison of Military Participants' Effort
With that of Non-Military Participants
(Expressed as percentages of response)

Degree	Army	Navy	Air Force	Composite
Heavier	38	40	26	35
Same	59	60	74	64
Lighter	3	0	0	1

desire to impress the non-military students with the zeal, ability, and dedication of military officers. Table 4-n, however, shows that this factor of "Desire to Show Service Well" was not predominantly expressed by military participants as influencing their application of effort. Furthermore, the

Table 4-n

Factors of Influence
On Application of Personal Effort by
Military Participants
(Expressed as percentages of response)

Factor Category	Army	Navy	Air Force	Composite
Personal Interest	35	42	46	41
Personal Pride & Competition	35	30	27	31
Desire to Show Service Well	18	13	16	15
Miscellaneous	12	15	11	13

other factors of personal interest, and personal pride coupled with competition, would ordinarily be expected to

influence non-military participants in the same manner, and to somewhat the same degree, as military participants. Perhaps military students, in designating the primary influences on application of their effort, were unduly influenced by a lack of perception in making the fine distinction between pride in attaining personal excellence and in showing the Service off well. For whatever the reason, or combination of reasons, which cannot be adequately segregated and measured in this study, one might conclude that military participants felt that they applied themselves every bit as diligently, and perhaps even more so, than did their non-military classmates. Perhaps, without realizing it, their favorability toward the Program and the impact received from their experience generally improved as their efforts increased.

Although some exaggeration, conscious or otherwise, may have colored the military response, there was evidence of a desire on the part of military respondents to overcome what they sensed to be conventional adverse prejudice on the part of the non-military populace. The satisfaction of this desire, by proving to their classmates the capabilities and caliber of military officers, may well have been the result of the increased effort perceived and reported by military respondents. Judging from the heavy application of personal effort and the extremely favorable attitude and impact experienced by military participants in the Program, the data in this study seems to support Andrews' and McKay's findings expressed at

the beginning of this discussion of Personal Effort to the effect that men favor courses which demand hard work and that impact improves with increased personal effort.

Climate Upon Return

The preponderance of literature on the effect of climate in executive development programs is indicative of the importance attributed to this aspect of training by those who have attempted to evaluate these programs. Climate, as used here, refers to the working environment and atmosphere experienced by the participant subsequent to his attendance at the Program.

There is general agreement among those evaluating the effects of executive development programs that job climate upon return from the program plays a significant part in determining impact experienced by the participant. In fact, Andrews pointed out that unless a man's subsequent experiences make it meaningful, the impact of a formal educational experience diminishes with time.[22] One of the purposes of this study was to determine how effectively military participants felt they were being utilized after having completed the Harvard Advanced Management Program.

---

[22] Kenneth R. Andrews, "Is Management Training Effective," Harvard Business Review, 35, (No. 1), (January-February 1957), 85-94.

The plan for collection of data concerning the effect of job climate on participants, involved a series of questions directed to the military participants themselves. Questions were designed to elicit information which, wherever possible, would lend itself to comparison with similar available data from non-military participants. Caution had to be exercised, however, to insure that military practices and procedures did not introduce aspects of incomparability. For example, the author suspected that the military practice of frequent planned rotation of military personnel to various duty assignments might not make comparison of data on military versus non-military executives very meaningful in this area of position changes. Nevertheless, in order to determine the validity of this assumption, question twelve from Andrews' questionnaire was adapted for use in this study and asked the participants (Question twenty-three) whether or not they had changed duty assignments since they attended the Program. The response to this question was then compared with Andrews' data on personnel turnover and tied in with the basic supposition expressed above.

Another area of incomparability between military and non-military personnel is the relationship of attendance at the Program with subsequent promotion. The somewhat rigid and variable promotion systems peculiar to the Services would not lend themselves to any meaningful comparisons with

the multitude of promotion structures associated with non-military personnel. In fact, according to Andrews, the relationship between attendance at an executive development program and subsequent promotion is difficuct to disentangle, even for the non-military participants.[23]

Because of the basic importance of job climate to program impact, however, an attempt was made to determine what kind of job and what type of climate prevailed in each duty assignment held by military participants since their completion of the Program. Military participants were therefore asked, in question twenty-five, to list each job they had held subsequent to completion of the Program and to indicate, in each instance, if an atmosphere existed which was conducive to application of their training experience. The response to this question gave a count on the frequency of rotations in duty assignments, the general nature of these assignments, and the participant's attitude and reaction toward the job, especially in light of his rather recent training experience.

The participants, in question twenty-four, were also requested to indicate their feelings about the relationships between their attendance at the Program and any increased responsibility that they had received since completing the

---

[23] Andrews, 1961, op. cit., p. 129.

Course. In addition to supplementing information about the duty assignment(s), together with the participants' reactions to such assignments, and providing information which was directly comparable to the data on non-military Harvard Advanced Management Program participants collected by Andrews, the response to this question helped provide insight into the participants' enthusiasm, favorability, and general impact regarding the overall Program.

Finally, in question twenty-six, participants were asked whether or not they thought the opportunity to apply the experience gained through the Program could have been used more effectively and, if so, how. The response to the forced choice portion of this question provided a check on the consistency of the answers to questions twenty-four and twenty-five, while the spontaneity of response encouraged by the latter part of the question afforded an opportunity to catch more of the feeling and sentiment of the respondent regarding this vital issue.

The following discussion of this factor of job climate and its relationship to Program impact will be organized first by Service group and then as a composite military position in comparison, where possible, with non-military participants.

Army

Over ninety per cent of the Army respondents had changed duty assignments since completing the Program. In

fact, Army participants had averaged 2.3 job changes from the time of their graduation up through the summer of 1964. By far the majority had found, at each of their duty stations, a pleasant atmosphere which was conducive to the application of their training experiences.

In reflecting back, a plurality of Army participants (forty-seven per cent) seemed uncertain as to how their Harvard Program related to any increased responsibility that they might have assumed since returning to work. Judging from the total questionnaire response of these participants, however, their reply of uncertainty definitely did not reflect a feeling of apathy but rather an indecision as to how these two experiences were related, if in fact they were.

Almost one-quarter of the Army respondents claimed the increased responsibility which they assumed after completion of their training bore no relationship to their attendance at the Program. Although most of even these participants were favorably disposed toward the Program, there were several that evidenced some degree of displeasure and a less favorable impact than those that were better able to see a relationship between their training experience and their vocational achievements. For instance, although accounting for only six per cent of respondents, those participants who felt that there was a direct relationship between their Program experience and the increased size of their job, and who felt that they

were rewarded because they applied what they had learned to their job, seemed to have been very enthusiastic about their Program and to have received the most favorable impact from their experience.

Army participants collectively reflected their highly favorable attitude when eighty-two per cent of the respondents said that they did not think that the opportunity to apply the experiences they had gained from the Program could have been used more effectively. The uniformity of suggestions by dissenters on how these experiences could be better used was amazing. Each respondent felt that if he had been more carefully assigned to a different functional specialty he could have been used more effectively. There was absolutely no mention of not having been given enough authority or responsibility - just the wrong type of work.

As might have been expected, those participants who did not feel they were being utilized to best advantage were, as a rule, less favorable toward the Program than were those who appeared to be more pleased with their assignment.

Navy

The Navy respondents had experienced the lowest number of changes in duty assignments of all three Services. What appears to be low for the Services, however, still represents a very high turnover rate since eighty-four per cent of Navy participants had changed positions between the time they completed their Course and the time they submitted

their questionnaire. Furthermore, these participants had averaged 1.9 position changes over this period of time. Only rarely did a respondent indicate that he found an atmosphere which was not conducive to application of his Program experience at his various duty stations.

Almost half of the Navy respondents were evenly divided between the categories of "uncertain" and "no relationship" in their recollection of how their training at Harvard related to any increase in responsibility that they had assumed since completing the Program. The overall attitude and response among participants within these two categories was almost imperceptible. Both groups of participants were very favorably disposed toward the Program. Their responses were not quite as enthusiastic and pointed, however, as were those of respondents who felt that they had been directly rewarded by applying their experiences from the Program or even those respondents who felt that a direct relationship existed but that they had been considered for positions of increased responsibility before attending the Program.

Of those respondents who said that they had received no increased responsibility since completing the Program, only one had actually changed positions. This individual, who had changed positions twice since graduation, was quite disappointed in the Navy's utilization of his services. He added the following note opposite his reply of no increased responsibility: "This is my sad disappointment. The Navy couldn't care less in my case. The Navy has not displayed even the <u>slightest</u> interest in my having attended the AMP." This respondent's attitude toward

the Program and his experiences, however, was very favorable. Nevertheless, the impact received seemed to be less than desirable from what appeared to be a failure to continue the stimulation cultivated during the training program.

Despite the esteem with which most Navy participants regarded the Program, twenty-nine per cent of the respondents said they thought their experiences gained from attending the Program could have been used more effectively. Even a great number of those who thought they might have been better utilized, however, expressed very favorable reactions to the Program. Almost two-thirds of this group considered that better utilization of experience, in their case, would have resulted if more care had been exercised in selecting their duty assignments to insure that the nature of the jobs to which they were assigned would make maximum use of their training. The balance of this group, however, was concerned more with failure on the part of their superiors to assign them greater responsibility commensurate with their positions and abilities.

There was a slight tendency on the part of those participants who felt satisfied about their assignments after graduation to be uniformly more favorable toward the Program than those who were somewhat dissatisfied with the way in which their experience and training were utilized.

Air Force

Air Force participants had the highest number of changes in duty assignments of all the Armed Forces. Ninety-seven per cent of the Air Force participants had been reassigned

since completing the Program and, in the period from graduation through the late summer of 1954, had, on the average, held 2.5 positions. The number of respondents who indicated that an atmosphere existed, in their various duty assignments, which was not conducive to the application of their training experiences was rather insignificant.

In expressing their opinions of the relationship between attendance at the Harvard Program and any increased responsibility which might have come to them upon completion of the Course, thirty-eight per cent of the Air Force participants said that they could see no relationship at all. Unlike the Navy participants in this category of response, however, Air Force participants indicated a distinctly less favorable attitude toward the Program than did their contemporaries.

The second most popular participant response (twenty-three per cent) in expressing relationships between Program attendance and increased responsibility was that of uncertainty as to whether or not a relationship actually existed. In spite of this expressed uncertainty, however, participants were predominantly favorable toward the Program.

On the other hand, respondents who claimed to have received no increase in responsibility, contrary to expectation, were not bitter or sarcastic in their evaluation of their training experience. In fact, this group evidenced consistently greater favorability than those who said they were uncertain as to what, if any, relationship existed. Needless to say, those individuals who saw a direct relationship between attendance and

responsibility were pleased and enthusiastic about the Program and their experiences in it.

It was interesting to note that fifty-five per cent of the Air Force participants felt that the opportunity to apply the experiences they gained through their attendance at the Program could have been used more effectively. This was, by far, the largest number of dissatisfied participants of any of the Services. Strangely enough, representatives at Air Force Headquarters predicted, before this study was initiated, that a great number of Air Force participants would probably feel that they had not been utilized most effectively upon completion of the Program. There was some concern by some respondents that many of the senior officers did not seem to recognize or appreciate the value of Advanced Management Program training. One individual said, "I don't believe it made any difference to anyone in the military whether I went to AMP or not." Without knowing more of the situation than was available in this participant's questionnaire, it would be difficult to determine if the individual or the sponsor was responsible for this feeling. It has been well established, however, that interest, enthusiasm, and participation by top management in the executive development movement is essential to obtaining maximum benefit from the overall development effort.

Almost half of those respondents who were disappointed in the effectiveness of their utilization thought that they should have been assigned more responsibility or considered for a higher position shortly after having completed

advanced management training. Many of the rest felt that they could have been more effectively utilized in a different type of assignment - possibly in a different field or specialty where their training experiences would have been more applicable.

Regardless of the reason for discontent, however, the frustration experienced by Air Force participants who were unhappy about the way they were used was not generally evidenced by a resentment or unfavorable reaction toward the Advanced Management Program but rather as a short-sightedness on the part of their sponsors.

Composite

The initial assumption of incomparability of military and non-military data on job changes because of the military practice of frequent, planned rotation of its officer personnel was upheld by the response of military personnel in this study. Table 4-o shows the tremendous spread, over

Table 4-o

Changes in Job Assignments
(Expressed as percentages of response)

Category	Job Change? Yes	No
Army	91	9
Navy	84	16
Air Force	97	3
Military Composite	91	9
Non-Military	10	90

approximately the same period of time, between the military and non-military participants which, of course, is not representative of the job mobility occasioned by attendance at the Advanced Management Program. What is not shown, however, is the fact that not only have more military participants moved from the positions they held at the time they attended the Program, but that, on the average, military participants have held 2.2 jobs from the time they finished the Program until they returned their questionnaires late in the summer of 1964.

The significance of the frequency of job changes is manifested in the uniform effort which must be exerted through an extremely large and geographically decentralized organization in order to insure a job climate conducive to application of the Program experience to which participants were exposed. The interest and support of top management cannot be overemphasized if the enthusiasm and participation of all lower levels of management are to effectively extend and stimulate the growth and development which was started in a formal college training program. This is not an easy task, especially in a large organization, such as the military, with strong central control fairly well defined through voluminous regulations and established procedures. Surprisingly enough, however, only fifteen per cent of all the jobs assigned to military personnel were rated by respondents as having an atmosphere which was not conducive to application

of Program experiences.

Most military participants, when asked about the relationship they saw between their attendance at the Program and any increased responsibility they may have received after graduation, were either uncertain of what, if any, relationship existed or felt that there was no relationship. Table 4-p provides a tabulation of the reactions of military participants and compares the military and non-military response.

One might expect to find participants who said that they had received no increased responsibilities since completion of their Course to be somewhat disturbed and perhaps unfavorably disposed toward the Program. If this was so, these

Table 4-p

Relationship Between AMP Attendance
And Participants' Increased Responsibility
(Expressed as percentages of response)

Relationship	Army	Navy	Air Force	Military Composite	Non-Military
Not Applicable - No Increase	9	17	13	12	13
No Relationship	23	23	38	28	14
Uncertain	47	23	23	32	33
Direct Relationship - I was Rewarded	6	17	13	12	17
Direct Relationship - But Previously Considered	15	20	13	16	23

feelings were not revealed through the questionnaire. On the contrary, the military participants in this category seemed very favorable in their regard for the Program, although there were some indications of disappointment with the sponsoring Service which definitely weakened the impact of the training experience.

Those military participants who saw no relationship between their attendance at the Program and their increased responsibility, although generally favorable in their reaction to the Program, displayed more resentment and tended to be less favorable than any other category of respondent. Perhaps this was the result of a feeling on the part of some participants that the nature of their subsequent military assignments or the level of their responsibilities did not maximize the benefits of their training. This, too, may account for the wide spread between military and non-military participants in this category since non-military participants changed jobs less frequently and might therefore be expected to have a slightly greater insight into how their training experiences would more specifically apply to their companies.

Military participants who were uncertain of any relationship between their training and their subsequent increased responsibilities apparently did not intend that this feeling of uncertainty serve as an indication of unfavorability

toward the Program. Judging from the predominantly favorable response to their questionnaires, those who were uncertain experienced a good impact from what they thought was a well worthwhile program but were just unable to draw a clear relationship between what they learned and what subsequently happened to them. This difficulty in determining relationships may have resulted from the broad coverage characteristic of the Program and its general nature of applicability.

There was no question but that those military participants who saw a direct relationship between their training experiences and their subsequent assumption of increased responsibilities expressed a more favorable and enthusiastic reaction to the Program and experienced a greater impact from their experience than those who failed to see any relationship. Where the participant felt that he was rewarded by applying his experiences, the enthusiasm seemed to be slightly greater and the response a little more spontaneous than in those instances where participants felt that they had already been marked for increased responsibility before attending the Program. The increased percentages of non-military participants who saw the direct relationship between their training and their job opportunities is probably attributable to the greater stability of working environment experienced by non-military personnel as previously mentioned.

Although the reaction of military participants to the Advanced Management Program was extremely and rather

uniformly favorable, one-third of these participants felt that their Program experience could have been used more effectively than it was. Table 4-q shows the significant variations in response between the three Services. The majority of

Table 4-q

Opinions on Most Effective Utilization of Management Training Experience
(Expressed as percentages of response)

	Could it Have Been Used More Effectively?	
Service Group	Yes	No
Army	18	82
Navy	29	71
Air Force	55	45
Composite	33	67

the respondents who thought they could have been used more effectively suggested that better utilization would have resulted if they had been more carefully assigned to specialty areas involving jobs that would have been more clearly associated with their training experiences and in which the maximum benefit of such training would have therefore been realized. Others, apparently not so concerned with the nature of their assignments, felt that their experiences would have been more effectively utilized if they had been given greater responsibility, both in the jobs they held and by being assigned to higher positions, with more responsibility, within

their organizations. Perhaps this merely reflects human ego, but there were some respondents, especially in the Air Force, who felt very strongly that their sponsoring agencies neither appreciated nor recognized the benefits which could accrue from advanced management training. Regardless of whether these feelings were individually justified or not, the impression existed that superiors either resisted new ideas and approaches which may have grown out of a formal educational program or were not interested in utilizing and advancing available talent. It is of utmost importance to any executive development program that top management, from the highest official on down, enthusiastically endorse and support the program through all levels of management if maximum effectiveness is to be realized. It is through the media of job climate upon return from a university-sponsored program that stimulation is extended and impact enhanced.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The research for this thesis has been directed toward evaluating the impact of the Harvard Advanced Management Program on United States military personnel. The effect of objectives and the influence of selected factors on impact have been examined and analyzed in an effort to determine the part they play in making the learning experience more effective and more meaningful to individual military participants. Comparisons have been made, wherever practicable, with the impact received by non-military personnel who have attended the same program and the differences and similarities between the causes of these two types of impact have been discussed.

The purpose of this chapter is to present a brief summary of the data discussed in this thesis and to introduce the conclusions drawn from these data. Both the summary and conclusions will be oriented toward pointing up:

(1) The overall effectiveness of the Advanced Management Program to military personnel;

(2) what significant variations, if any, exist in the degree of impact experienced by participants affiliated with each of the three major Services;

(3) how the impact of the Program, as experienced by military participants, compares with the

impact experienced by non-military participants, and

(4) how military sponsoring activities may be able to improve the impact experienced by military participants in the Program.

Despite the exceptionally high degree of widespread favorability toward the Advanced Management Program indicated among military participants, there were several instances throughout this study where it was apparent that improvements might be realized which could further strengthen the impact received by military participants in the Program and improve the participation of the three military services. These instances are identified throughout the summary which follows.

With the benefit of perspective provided by the analysis and discussion of related data in this thesis, the importance of training objectives takes on more obvious significance. It became evident that the objectives of the training institution must define, among other things, the management level to which instruction is aimed. Although the Advanced Management Program objectives followed the prevalent pattern toward generality, they seemed to have adequately defined the management level of participants, at least so far as the military was concerned, since all three Services have been using the Program consistently for top level

management training.

Military data tended to confirm the hypothesis that the perceived degree of benefit, to both the Service and the individual participant, realized from a university-sponsored program is closely related to the clarity and adequacy of the anticipation of expected value and the sense of purpose in attending the program. Based on this observation, sponsoring activities would be well advised to formulate more specific training objectives which would assist their participants in developing more meaningful personal objectives as guidelines or references in orienting themselves for the new training experiences to which they will be subjected. The extremely general objectives adopted and disseminated by the Army and Air Force sponsors, for instance, seem to have afforded little or no help to participants of those Services in formulating their own personal objectives. Navy sponsoring activities cited numerous more specific training objectives but the existence or dissemination of these formal objectives prior to the time they were requested for purposes of this study, was subject to question. The widespread denial, by participants from all Services, of the receipt, from their sponsors, of training objectives or of any other helpful information concerning their participation in the Program attests to either a lack of such information on the part of the sponsor or poor communication between sponsor and participants.

Furthermore, rather strong indications from many of the participants to the effect that they would have preferred to receive some helpful information, together with an acknowledgement as to the significance of their selection, indicates a receptiveness toward assistance from the sponsoring activity. This assistance might consist of a communication explaining why the participant was selected (even though it may be assumed that he should know this intuitively), what the sponsors' objectives were in sending him to school, what was expected of him both during and following the Course, the significance of this training to his military career, and what he might expect, by way of a career pattern, upon completion of the Program. The small amount of additional time and effort required in adequately preparing a participant for attendance at the Program could pay off handsomely in improved impact experienced by that participant which, in turn, directly reflects the benefit of participation to sponsors.

The importance of adequately preparing selectees for participation in the Advanced Management Program and in giving them sufficient help and encouragement to formulate sound personal objectives is highlighted because of the relatively high positive correlation found to exist between the participants' personal objectives and the benefits the participants claim to have received from attendance at the Program.

In addition to the influence and importance of objectives, there were a number of other factors which exerted varying degrees of influence on the impact of the Advanced Management Program as experienced and related by individual participants.

Most military participants, as did their non-military contemporaries, thought that thirteen weeks was about the right length of time for the Harvard Program. This reaction was consistent with the exceptionally favorable military attitude toward the overall training experience, especially considering the inherent problem in longer training programs of maintaining student interest and enthusiasm. Furthermore, this characteristic favorability takes on even greater meaning in light of Andrews' observation that favorability experienced in longer courses should be considered of more significance than comparable favorability in shorter courses and of McKay's findings that longer training programs tend to result in greater impact than shorter ones. The Harvard Program, of course, is one of the longest university-sponsored executive development training programs.

Although the data on military participants confirmed the hypothesis that they prefer courses of a non-functional nature having to do more with the broad or overall perspective of top level management, as opposed to

functionally-oriented courses, this preference was shared with the non-military participants. Military respondents did, however, feel that their rating of course interest was primarily a reflection of the basic interests they brought with them to the Program, whereas non-military participants seemed to be influenced more strongly by the manner in which the course was taught. This observation could have significant implications for sponsoring activities in that, by helping their participants establish appropriate personal objectives, the participants' interests could be channeled into those areas considered most profitable and meaningful for the benefit of all concerned. Also to be considered, in this respect, of course, is the necessity for the sponsor not to unduly interfere with or stifle the participants' individual initiative and the fact that, consciously or unconsciously, the manner in which the courses were presented did exercise varying degrees of influence on the individuals' interest and application.

Enthusiasm for the Harvard Program was demonstrated by (1) an almost unanimous response against substituting for it a military-type executive development program and (2) a less pronounced but positive reaction toward sending military officers to the Advanced Management Program rather than to a senior military school if such a choice was necessary. While the response to the first situation was

exceptionally strong and uniform between the Services, there was a decided split in the three Services' response to the latter. Both the Navy and Air Force participants strongly favored the Advanced Management Program over a senior military school but the Army participants, even more strongly, opposed it on the basis that a military school offered a curriculum which was more directly applicable to the needs of military officers. Although this reasoning pervaded most of the objections of those who opposed the idea, the over-riding preference for the Advanced Management Program is indicative of the convictions of military participants concerning the value of its impact for them.

Military participants, rather consistently, indicated a considerably more favorable reaction to the Advanced Management Program faculty's teaching effectiveness than did non-military participants. Furthermore, there was a close positive correlation between responses evidencing dissatisfaction with the faculty and those reflecting an unfavorable reaction to the overall Program, which supported Andrews' findings to the same effect and would tend to indicate a somewhat more favorable reaction to the Program by military participants than by non-military. This supports the preponderantly favorable overall reaction of military participants to the Program and tends to confirm Andrews'

findings that military personnel are more inclined to be highly favorable toward their executive development programs than are personnel sponsored by private enterprise. Although most military participants did not think that the way in which the course was taught influenced their interest as much as did their own basic interest in the subject matter at the time they entered the Program, almost everybody recognized, in some degree, the influence of the faculty on their rating of personal interest in each subject area. Evidence even indicated that some military participants were influenced more by the faculty and the quality of instruction than they appeared to either realize or acknowledge. Non-military participants, on the other hand, seemed to be somewhat more heavily influenced by the way in which the course was taught. From this we may conclude that, while the data on military respondents tends to support the hypothesis that faculty does exert a significant influence on the impact of participants in university-sponsored executive development programs, the significance of this influence on military personnel does not appear to be as substantial as that experienced by non-military participants.

The stimulating experience of exchanging ideas and associating with high caliber, top-level executive students, diversified as to location, business function, and

industry, was considered by most military participants to be one of the most rewarding benefits they received from the Program. Their exceptionally strong objection to substituting a military-oriented executive development program left no doubt that military participants valued highly their exposure to a cross-section of carefully selected national and foreign non-military executives as well as to a limited number of senior military officers from each of the three Services. The attitudes and reactions expressed by military participants strongly supported the conclusions of researchers that class composition does play an important part in determining the impact of management development training programs on participants.

The number of military participants who originated the idea of their attending the Program was considerably higher than that of non-military participants, but there was quite a disparity in the responses from the three Services. While the number of self-starters was rather high among Air Force and Navy participants, the Army had about the same low percentage of self-starters as was found in the non-military group. On the other hand, when considering those participants who did not themselves take the initiative, non-military participants reacted more favorably and possessed fewer reservations about attending the Program than did their

military contemporaries. In attempting to relate these findings, however, to overall favorability toward the Program, only two discernible trends emerged. There was a tendency for self-starters without reservations to experience a somewhat greater impact, and, conversely, a tendency for participants who reacted unfavorably toward their selection, and who had serious reservations about the value of the Course to them, to experience a relatively poor impact. Except for these two extremes, however, there did not seem to be any consistent pattern of impact.

Reservations about attending the Program reflected, primarily, the work habits, background, and experiences of the individual participants. Military personnel were chiefly concerned with the financial implications of personally having to finance the deficit between their actual and reimbursed expenses incurred while attending the Program and about the prolonged period of time during which they would be separated from their jobs. Non-military participants, however, were more concerned about being away from their families and about their personal ability to compete favorably in a new academically-oriented environment.

In view of the above observations, sponsoring activities might be able to improve the impact which their participants receive from the Advanced Management Program by

(1) considering means for alleviating the financial hardship imposed on participants, thereby eliminating their principal source of reservations, by (2) encouraging prospective and eligible participants to voluntarily express their desire to attend the Program, and by (3) ensuring that those candidates selected on the initiative of the sponsor are favorably inclined toward the Program and have no serious reservations concerning their attendance.

There was a definite reluctance on the part of military participants to extend eligibility for attendance at the Advanced Management Program to officers below the ranks of Colonel (Army and Air Force) and Captain (Navy). Despite the recognition of the possibility for greater pay-back through extended military service expected of younger and less senior officers, most respondents felt that the maturity and experience level possessed by officers of this rank structure was essential for comparability with the approximate age, experience, and management level of their non-military associates. While this reaction predominated, it was by no means uniform between the Services. Army and Navy participants very strongly opposed the idea of sponsoring less senior officers while a slight majority of the Air Force participants, who were considerably younger, on the average, than their

Army and Navy contemporaries, favored sending younger, less senior officers to the Program. A compromise suggestion was offered by a number of participants, however, proposing that sponsors continue to consider only Colonels and Captains for attendance at the Program but select candidates who have recently been promoted to that rank or who are junior in the rank. Since military participants were slightly over two and one-half years older, on the average, than non-military participants, and since age, in itself, did not seem to exert any significant influence on training impact, such a suggestion to sponsors appears to have merit.

Military participants possessed considerably more formal education than did non-military participants in the Program. Although there was a tendency for non-college graduates to receive a somewhat greater impact from the Program than college graduates, the number of military respondents who were not college graduates was very small and the trend was not very pronounced. Consequently, this observation should certainly not be used by sponsors as the basis for concentrating on the selection of non-college graduates to attend the Program. At the other extreme, the only participant holding a doctors degree experienced a relatively poor impact from the Program. These data, although statistically insignificant, at least tend to confirm the hypotheses that

non-college graduates tend to experience a slightly greater impact than college graduates and that favorability and impact decrease as educational levels of participants increase. The extremely small size of the population in the extreme categories and the fact that no perceptible trends were detected between bachelor and master degree levels, however, limits the validity of these observations. Since the amount of formal education possessed by a participant seemed to exert a relatively insignificant effect on the impact experienced from the Program, sponsors should not penalize a truly outstanding officer, otherwise eligible to attend the Program, by refusing to nominate him on the basis of inadequate formal education.

While most military participants thought they had applied themselves most diligently during their attendance at the Program, they also thought that the non-military participants worked just about as hard. Personal interest in the Course was mentioned most frequently by participants as the motivating force behind their application of individual effort. Although only a rather small percentage of the military participants specifically mentioned a desire to show the Service off well as the factor most influencing their application of effort, there were strong feelings expressed about the importance of this motive by many of the respondents

who considered the Advanced Management Program as a public relations media where influential and responsible business leaders could observe the competence of military officers. Perhaps, also, many of those military participants who claimed that they were motivated primarily by their personal pride in excelling, especially in the face of competition, may have felt that, by so doing, they were automatically shedding a favorable light on the Service of which they were a member. For whatever reason, there was evidence of increased favorability and greater impact among those participants who rated their application of personal effort as heavy. This tends to support the theories that participants favor courses which are demanding of their effort and that the impact received from such courses improves with the application of increased personal effort.

Maintaining an optimum, uniform job climate for stimulating and extending the growth of participants in the Advanced Management Program upon their completion of the Course, is an extremely difficult task within the Armed Services due to the wide geographical spread and the diversified and complex nature of the military operations. This, together with the exceptionally frequent movements of officers within the military establishment, may account for the tendency of military participants to be less aware than their non-military contemporaries of the relationship between their

attendance at the Program and any increased responsibility received since completion of their training. Those military participants who saw no relationship between their training and their increased responsibilities were less favorably disposed toward the Program and received a somewhat poorer impact from their experience than did those who either had received no increased responsibility or those who were uncertain as to what, if any, relationship existed between training and responsibility. A significantly greater number of Air Force respondents fell in this category of those who saw no relationship than did the participants of either of the other two Services. In contrast, those who experienced the greatest impact and who were most favorable and enthusiastic toward the Program were those participants who saw a direct relationship between their training and what happened to them subsequently - and especially those who felt that they were rewarded as a result of their training experience. Consequently, an attempt on the part of sponsoring activities to match training with increased responsibility accorded to graduates of the Program, or even an attempt to help the individual logically relate his training experiences to his job assignment, might result in perceptibly greater impact.

Despite the quite uniform very favorable reaction of military participants to the Program, one-third of the

respondents thought that the opportunity to apply the experiences they had gained from the Program could have been used more effectively. The inter-Service response, however, was anything but uniform. While the Army participants seemed to be the best satisfied, over one-half of the Air Force participants were unhappy with the way they were utilized upon completion of the Program. This can be related to the observation that the Air Force also had a significantly higher percentage of respondents who could see no relationship between their training experiences and their assignment of increased responsibility and the fact that a representative at Air Force Headquarters informed the author, prior to initiation of this study, that Air Force respondents would probably be unhappy with the way their training experiences were subsequently utilized. Further investigation, with the Air Force, as to the reason behind these observations disclosed that approximately one-third of all Air Force Colonels are very senior in grade because of early dates of rank extending back to 1951 and earlier. These officers will probably never be promoted but have not yet been forced to retire. They are not eligible to attend the Advanced Management Program because of being too long in grade without having been promoted, yet they occupy the senior jobs for Colonels and thereby block younger Colonels, some of whom have attended the Advanced Management Program, from occupying desirable military line and staff

assignments involving increased responsibility. This explanation supports the comments of those dissatisfied military participants who expressed opinions as to how they could have been used more effectively. Most of these participants felt that they could have been employed more effectively in a different functional specialty more closely associated with their training, while a significant, yet smaller, group thought that they should have received greater responsibility.

Realizing some of the operational limitations, sponsoring activities must recognize the importance of top level support and participation in an executive development program which permeates all levels of management and which further develops and cultivates the growth process initiated in a formal training program. Only in this manner can the greatest return on investment be realized through sustaining the favorable impact experienced by individual military participants who have attended the Advanced Management Program.

The essence of the above summary and conclusions was discussed with a representative number of Army, Navy, and Air Force graduates of the Advanced Management Program. Included in those interviewed were military participants who attended the Program prior to the period covered by this

study, participants who attended during the period of the study and who had been surveyed by questionnaire, participants who attended subsequent to the period covered by the study, and those currently attending but just concluding the Program. The purpose of these interviews was to determine reactions to both the data collected through questionnaires and to the conclusions drawn from these data. The reactions of the cross-section sample of participants who were thus interviewed served as a rough validation of the data and conclusions resulting from this study.

The general reaction of those participants who were interviewed was that of acceptance and agreement with the summary of data and the related conclusions. Even in those instances where the interviewee had responded, in his questionnaire, contrary to the majority opinion, he many times would acknowledge no surprise concerning the outcome of the survey. On one such occasion, the interviewee even offered an explanation as to why members from his branch of the Service responded as they did in opposition to the responses from participants of the other two Services. Those issues which provoked unusually strong reactions or helped develop additional insight will be discussed briefly.

The conclusions concerning objectives were very strongly endorsed. All interviewees agreed that sponsors'

objectives were too general to be of any real help to them in formulating their personal objectives and many of them said they would like to have been told more by their sponsor concerning the reasons and implications of their selection for attendance at the Program.

There was some surprise, especially from certain Navy interviewees, concerning the expression of participants that their rating of interest in various courses was based primarily on their basic interest in the subject as opposed to the way in which the course was taught. This reaction on the part of interviewees, although not predominant, was understandable because of the wide range of responses to this issue and the almost unanimous acknowledgement of participants that the manner of presentation did have some degree of influence on personal interest.

When informed that Army participants generally and strongly opposed the popular opinion of participants from the other two Services that senior military officers would gain more from attending the Advanced Management Program than from a military program such as the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, one Army interviewee expressed an explanation to substantiate the Army's position. He pointed out that attendance at the various Service schools has traditionally played an extremely vital role in preparing Army officers

for promotion and that the Advanced Management Program is not yet recognized within the Army establishment as an acceptable substitute for such training in conventional career planning patterns. This opinion was substantiated by other Army interviewees.

Although there was no disagreement with the summary or conclusions concerning the expression of relationships between attendance at the Program and subsequent increased responsibility, several interviewees remarked about the difficulty which they, and perhaps others, had in trying to relate these experiences. This merely reinforced both the implicit and explicit difficulties participants seem to have experienced in trying to express their reactions to this question on relationships in their questionnaire. Many participants found it difficult to determine, in their own minds, whether or not the increased responsibility which they had received would have been accorded them regardless of whether they had attended the Program.

The cordial reception, genuine interest, enthusiasm, and overall favorable attitude displayed by all of those who were interviewed reflected the same type of behavior which characterized the military population included in this study.

Many of the interviewees expressed the opinion that they considered the study well worthwhile and hoped that at least some of the conclusions would result in efforts by their sponsoring activities to improve military participation in the Advanced Management Program.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

for

SPONSORS OF PARTICIPANTS IN THE ADVANCED MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

1. What are the stated objectives for participation of your officers in the Advanced Management Program at Harvard?

   a. Have these objectives changed within the past five years?

      If so, in what respect?

2. What were prospective participants told after being selected for the Program but prior to attendance? (e.g., Were candidates told why they were selected, what the sponsor's objectives were in sending military officers to school, what was expected of them, etc.?)

3. What changes are expected in the officers participating in the Program?

   a. Are these changes expected immediately? If not, how soon?

HARVARD UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Doctoral Research

STUDY OF EXECUTIVE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Confidential

1. AT THE TIME OF YOUR ATTENDANCE at the Advanced Management Program, indicate:

   a. Number of years of military service _____.

   b. Age _____.

   c. Rank _____.

2. Education

   a. Indicate the number of years of schooling completed:

   High School . . . . . ☐

   College (1 year) . . . . . ☐

   College (2 years) . . . . . ☐

   College (3 years) . . . . . ☐

   College (4 years) . . . . . ☐

   College (5 years or more) . . . . . ☐

   b. Degrees and diplomas received:

   High School . . . . . ☐

   Bachelor's (A.B., B.S., or A.A.) . . . . . ☐

   L.L.B. . . . . ☐

   Master's (A.M., M.S., M.B.A., etc.) . . . . . ☐

   Doctor's (Ph.D., M.D., E.D., D.B.A., etc.) . . . ☐

   c. List any other civilian or service schools completed, together with the dates of attendance and the approximate length of the program.

Course of Study	Approximate Beginning and Ending Dates	Approximate Length

3. Indicate the date you completed the Advanced Management Program.

_____ Month _____ Year

4. Who initiated the idea of your attending the program?

I did . . . . . ☐

My sponsor . . . . . ☐

a. If it was your sponsor, what was your first reaction to the news that you had been selected to attend the program?

Favorable . . . . . ☐

Indifferent . . . . . ☐

Mixed . . . . . ☐

Unfavorable . . . . . ☐

5. Did you have any reservations about going to the program?

Yes . . . . . ☐

No . . . . . ☐

a. If yes, what were they?

6. What, if anything, were you told by your sponsoring activity upon selection but prior to attendance at the program? (e.g. Were you told why you were selected, what your sponsor's objectives for training were, what was expected of you while in school, etc.?)

a. What, if anything, would you prefer to have been told?

7. What did you hope to get out of the program?

a. Did your desires, in this respect, change during the course? If so, how?

8. What do you think happened to you as a result of having attended the Advanced Management Program?

9. At the time of your selection, to what extent were you motivated by intention of applying any benefits derived from the program to civilian pursuits?

A real consideration . . . . . ☐

Moderate consideration . . . . . ☐

No consideration . . . . . ☐

10. How do you feel about the length of the program? Was it

too short . . . . . ☐

about right . . . . . ☐

too long . . . . . ☐

11. If you considered the program to be too short or too long, how long would you like it to be?

a. Would you care to state why?

12. What did you think of the faculty's teaching effectiveness? (Please be specific, citing strengths and weaknesses.)

13. Please indicate your reaction to the following areas of study included in your Advanced Management Program.

Courses	Degrees of Personal Interest				
	None	Somewhat	Moderate	Very Much	Greatest
Administrative Practices					
Labor Relations					
Business and the World Society					
Marketing					
Business Policy					
Accounting and Finance					
Business History					

14. In the preceeding question, to what extent is your expression of interest a reflection of the way in which the different areas were taught and to what extent is it a reflection of your basic interest in these areas?

15. Were you primarily concerned with development of:

reasoning and thought processes? . . . . . ☐
or with
specific administrative skills? . . . . . ☐

16. Did you consider the diverse backgrounds and the caliber of students composing your class to be of benefit in your training program? Why?

17. Do you think you would have benefited more from a military-sponsored course in executive development attended exclusively by military personnel?

Yes . . . . . ☐

No . . . . . ☐

18. Now that you have had the experience of attending the Advanced Management Program, what is your candid reaction about having other officers in your branch of the service attend this program?

Very highly favorable . . . . . ☐

Highly favorable . . . . . ☐

Moderately favorable . . . . . ☐

Not very favorable . . . . . ☐

Not at all favorable . . . . . ☐

a. Would you recommend a military program such as the Industrial College for the Armed Forces as having more value to military officers if a choice were necessary between such a military program and the Advanced Management Program?

Yes . . . . . ☐ No . . . . . ☐

b. If yes, why? Which military program did you have in mind?

19. What is your reaction toward having somewhat younger and slightly less senior officers attend the Harvard Advanced Management Program earlier in their military careers (e.g. perhaps senior Lieutenant Colonels or Commanders age 38 to 40)?

20. How would you rate your personal application of effort during attendance at the program?

Heavy . . . . . ☐

Moderate . . . . ☐

Light . . . . . ☐

21. What factors most influenced your personal application of effort or lack thereof?

22. From your experience and personal acquaintances, how would you rate yours and other military participants' applications of effort during the program as compared with the personal effort expended by non-military participants?

Heavier . . . . . ☐

About the same . ☐

Lighter . . . . . ☐

23. Have you changed duty assignments since you attended the program?

Yes . . . . . ☐

No . . . . . ☐

24. What do you feel is the relationship between your attendance at the Advanced Management Program and any increase in responsibility that may have come to you while you were at the program or since you returned to your work?

Not applicable - no increase in responsibility . . . . . ☐

No relationship to program attendance . . . . . ☐

Uncertain as to any relationship . . . . . ☐

Direct relationship - I was rewarded by applying my experiences from the program . . . . . ☐

Direct relationship but I was considered or selected for increased responsibility before attending the program . . . . . ☐

25. List below, in chronological order, starting with your first assignment upon completion of the Advanced Management Program, all your duty assignments up to and including your present assignment.

Job Title	Inclusive Dates	Did an Atmosphere Exist Which Was Conducive to Application of Your Program Experience?	
_____	_____	Yes ☐	No ☐
_____	_____	Yes ☐	No ☐
_____	_____	Yes ☐	No ☐
_____	_____	Yes ☐	No ☐
_____	_____	Yes ☐	No ☐

26. Do you think the opportunity to apply the experience gained through your attendance at the program could be used more effectively?

Yes . . . . . ☐

No . . . . . ☐

a. If yes, how?

Doctoral Research

Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration

Reply to:

Doctoral House
Harvard Business School
Boston, Mass. 02163

Dear Sir:

Attached is a questionnaire asking for candid reactions to your attendance at the Harvard Advanced Management Program. This information is being solicited from military personnel of the Army, Navy, and Air Force who have graduated from the Advanced Management Program during the past six years. As a military doctoral student here at the Harvard Business School, I intend to use the data in a study evaluating the impact of the Advanced Management Program on military as compared with non-military personnel. The principal objectives of this study are to evaluate the overall effectiveness of the Advanced Management Program for military personnel and to determine what can be done to improve the impact experienced by military participants of the program.

Your replies to this questionnaire will be used in group comparisons and will in no way be individually identifiable. You are requested not to indicate your name or to sign your reply.

Although the Army, Navy, and Air Force have cooperated and are individually interested in the results of this study, the returned questionnaires will be handled in confidence and will not be made available to any Armed Services representatives. Furthermore, these questionnaires will not be made available to Harvard University but will be destroyed upon completion of this study.

I would sincerely appreciate your taking the time to promptly and conscientiously answer the questions attached hereto and wish to thank you for your contribution to a study which should contribute to improved military utilization of the Advanced Management Program.

Very respectfully,

N. R. HARBAUGH
Commander, SC, U.S. Navy

Enclosure

thesH2048
Evaluation of the impact of an executive
3 2768 002 08148 1
DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY